

14. W. C.

THE

# ECLECTIC REVIEW.

MDCCCXXXIV.

JANUARY—JUNE.

59

THIRD SERIES.

VOL. XI.

---

Φιλοσοφίαν δὲ οὐ τὴν Στωικὴν λέγω, οὐδὲ τὴν Πλατωνικὴν, ἢ τὴν Ἐπικουρεῖον τι καὶ Ἀριστοτελικήν· ἀλλ' ὅσα εἴρηται παρ' ἑκάστη τῶν αἰρεσίων τούτων καλῶς, δικαιοσύνην μετὰ εὐσιβούς· ἰπιστήμης ἰκιδιδάσκοντα, τοῦτο σύμπαν τὸ ἘΚΛΕΚΤΙΚΟΝ φιλοσοφίαν φῆμι.

CLEM. ALEX. *Strom.* L. 1.

---

LONDON:

JACKSON AND WALFORD,

18, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD.

---

1834.

# PHYSIOLOGICAL REVIEW

BY

W. D. HALL

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF

G. WOODFALL, ANGEL COURT, SKINNER STREET, LONDON.

FOR

THE

LIBRARY

OF

# CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Act to regulate the Labour of Children and young Persons in the Mills and Factories of the United Kingdom . . . . .	1
Amethyst, The, for 1834 . . . . .	81
Amicable Controversy with a Jewish Rabbi on the Messiah's Coming; unfolding new Views on the Prophecy and the Nature of the Millennium, &c. . . . .	85
Answer to a Letter addressed to the Lord Chancellor on the Case of the Dissenters . . . . .	319
Auber's China. An Outline of its Government, Laws, and Policy . . . . .	369
Binney's Address delivered on laying the First Stone of the New King's Weigh-House, a Place of Worship intended for the Use of a Congregational Church . . . . .	43
——— Ultimate Object of Evangelical Dissenters avowed and advocated . . . . .	402
Blakey's History of Moral Science . . . . .	136
Book of the Unveiling, an Exposition, with Notes . . . . .	85
Bulmer's Messiah's Kingdom . . . . .	217
Burton's Thoughts on the Separation of Church and State . . . . .	169
Bush's Treatise on the Millennium, in which the prevailing Theories on that Subject are carefully examined, &c. . . . .	85
Byrth's Observations on the Neglect of the Hebrew Language, and on the best Mode of Promoting its Cultivation among the Clergy . . . . .	134
Cabinet Illustrations for Pocket Editions of the Holy Bible and the Book of Common Prayer . . . . .	392
Case, The, of the Dissenters, in a Letter addressed to the Lord Chancellor . . . . .	43
Crichton's History of Arabia, ancient and modern . . . . .	484
Colton's Church and State in America . . . . .	169
Conversational Exercises on the Gospels . . . . .	502
Designs of the Dissenters, a Letter to the King . . . . .	303
Dissenter's Appeal, The, a Letter to the Right Hon. Earl Grey . . . . .	161
D'Oyley's Letter to the Right Hon. Earl Grey, on the subject of Church Rates . . . . .	319
Edinburgh Review, No. CXVII. Art. I. National Education in England and France . . . . .	1
Europe during the Middle Ages . . . . .	199
First Blast, The, of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Usurpation of Church Patrons in Scotland . . . . .	43
Foreign Quarterly Review, No. XXIV. Art. I. Necessity and Practicability of a National System of Education . . . . .	1
Fraser's historical and descriptive Account of Persia, from the Earliest Ages to the Present Time . . . . .	483
Gibson's Principle of Voluntary Churches, not the Principle of an Establishment, proved to be the Real Origin of Romish and Priestly Domination, an Historical Essay . . . . .	43
Gutzlaff's Journal of Three Voyages along the Coast of China in 1831, 32, and 33 . . . . .	369
Heman's, Mrs., Hymns for Childhood . . . . .	419
——— National Lyrics, and Songs for Music . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Heugh's, Dr., Considerations on Civil Establishments of Religion . . . . .	43
Holmes's Time of the End, a Series of Lectures on Prophetic Chronology . . . . .	85
Horæ Otiosæ; or, Thoughts, Maxims, and Opinions . . . . .	516
Horne's Bibliographical Notes on the Book of Jasher . . . . .	79
Hull's Deep Sense of Injury, and the Exposure of Wrongs, not inconsistent with Christian Humility . . . . .	149
——— Ecclesiastical Establishments not inconsistent with Christianity . . . . .	140
Illustrations of the Bible, from Original Paintings, made expressly by Richard Westall, Esq., R.A., and John Martin, Esq. . . . .	392
Innes's Ecclesiastical Establishments indefensible . . . . .	402
James's Pastor's Address to his People, on the Principles of Dissent, and the Duties of Dissenters . . . . .	161
Landscape Illustrations of the Bible . . . . .	392
Lee's Dissent unscriptural and unjustifiable, &c. . . . .	504
——— Remarks on the Dean of Peterborough's Tract, entitled, "Thoughts on the Admission of Persons, without regard to their Religious Opinions, to certain Degrees in the Universities of England" . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>

	PAGE
Letter to the Members of both Houses of Parliament, on Dissenters' Petitions, and on Church Grievances; by a late Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford . . .	169
—— Right Hon. Earl Grey, Premier, containing a Vindication of the Established Church, &c., by a Dissenting Minister . . .	319
Literary Intelligence . . . . .	84. 165. 250. 342. 423. 523
Lyte's Poems, chiefly religious . . . . .	38
Mackray on the Causes, Influence, and Prospects of the Secession, in connection with the Prospects of the Church of Scotland . . . . .	43
Marshall's Reply to the Vindication of Ecclesiastical Establishments, by the late Rev. John Inglis, D.D. . . . .	319
Marvel's Rights of the National Church, and Six Reasons for maintaining them against the Encroachments of Dissenters . . . . .	402
Might, The, and Mastery of the Established Church laid low, a Review and refutation of the principal Arguments of the Rev. Drs. Inglis and Chalmers, &c. . . . .	319
Moral and Spiritual Influence of the Church of England . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Mysteries of Time; or Banwell Cave, a Poem . . . . .	312
Nolan's Time of the Millennium investigated . . . . .	85
Olympia Morata, her Times, Life, and Writings . . . . .	116
O'Brien's Attempt to explain and establish the Doctrine of Justification by Faith only . . . . .	345
—— Two Sermons upon Hebrews, iv. 15 . . . . .	361
Picture-Bible for the Young . . . . .	392
Pilgrims of the Rhine, by the Author of "Pelham" . . . . .	395
Planché's Lays and Legends of the Rhine . . . . .	395
Poetical Works of the Rev. George Crabbe . . . . .	253
Political Christianity. State Patronage and Government Support, in National Establishments of Religion, not only ineffective as a Means of Propagating Divine Truth, but pernicious to the Nation, and obstructive to the Progress of Scriptural Religion, &c. . . . .	319
Pringle's African Sketches . . . . .	425
Religious Reform impracticable without Separation from the State. By Mathetes . . . . .	402
Reports of the British and Foreign School Society . . . . .	1
Robertson's Discourses, shewing the Structure and Unity of the Apocalypse . . . . .	85
Russell's Connection of Sacred and Profane History, from the Death of Joshua to the Decline of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah . . . . .	442
Scott's Popular Education in England . . . . .	1
Serious Address to Protestant Dissenters in the present Crisis, by a Puritan . . . . .	402
Smith's Seven Letters on National Religion, addressed to the Rev. H. Melvill, A.M. . . . .	43
——, Dr., Necessity of Religion to the Well-being of a Nation, a Sermon, &c. . . . .	319
Speech of the Lord Chancellor on the Education of the People . . . . .	1
Speeches of the Rev. Joseph Coltman, M.A., the Rev. J. Scott, and the Rev. J. King, M.A., at a Meeting of the Clergy, held at Beverley . . . . .	247
Stephenson's Sword unsheathed . . . . .	<i>ib.</i>
Stow's Memoirs of Rowland Taylor, LL.D., &c. . . . .	518
Stuart's New Translation of the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans, with a Commentary, &c. . . . .	289
Sumner's, Bp., Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Winchester . . . . .	239
Sword, the, acuminated . . . . .	402
Treatise on Happiness, consisting of Observations on Health, Property, the Mind and the Passions, &c. . . . .	80
Tudor's Narrative of a Tour in North America . . . . .	207
Turton's Text of the English Bible considered . . . . .	128
Union of the Methodists and the Church calmly considered . . . . .	402
Vaughan on the Study of General History . . . . .	49
Wakefield's Public Expenditure apart from Taxation . . . . .	230
Wall's Christ Crucified, an Epic Poem . . . . .	217
Wardlaw's Christian Ethics; or Moral Philosophy on the Principles of Divine Revelation . . . . .	21
Wiffen's Historical Memoirs of the House of Russell . . . . .	278
Works recently published . . . . .	84. 168. 252. 344. 424. 524



# THE ECLECTIC REVIEW,

FOR JANUARY, 1834.

---

- Art. I. 1. *Reports of the British and Foreign School Society, 1831-2-3.* 8vo.
2. *Reports of the National Society, 1831-2-3.* 8vo.
3. *An Act to regulate the Labour of Children and Young Persons in the Mills and Factories of the United Kingdom, passed 29th August, 1833.* 3 & 4 Will. IV. Chap. ciii.
4. *Speech of the Lord Chancellor on the Education of the People, as reported in the Times and Morning Chronicle of March 15, 1833.*
5. *Edinburgh Review, No. CXVII. Art. 1. National Education in England and France.*
6. *Foreign Quarterly Review, No. XXIV. Art. 1. Necessity and Practicability of a National System of Education.*
7. *Popular Education in England.* By D. D. Scott, Esq. London, 1833.

**T**HAT it is the duty of a Christian People, to take care that, in some way or other, facilities are afforded for the instruction of its youth, we suppose few will dispute. The God who constituted the various relations of social life, has imposed the obligation. It is the order of His providence, that every successive generation of the human family, shall in this particular, as well as in many others, be dependent upon that which precedes it. The chain which thus binds together the children of men, cannot be severed:—the responsibility which the connection involves, can never be evaded.

There are, it is true, a goodly number still to be found, who practically maintain the strange paradox, that it is not the will of God that *all* his rational creatures should be, in any enlarged sense of the word, intelligent. With such persons, we hold no

controversy. It would be a mere waste of words, to reason with men so incapable of estimating the dignity of their species,—so wilfully ignorant of the genius of the Gospel.

The doubts of the weak, and the alarms of the timid, with regard to the consequences which may be expected to result from the general diffusion of knowledge, would be worthy of more respect, but for their *irreligious* character and tendency. God himself has explicitly declared, that “for the soul to be without knowledge is not good.” We dare not, therefore, sympathize with terrors which are founded in distrust of His wisdom, or venture to excuse precautions which would seek an imaginary security in the degradation of His creature.

The plain truth is, that all objections to the education of the poor, come from what source they will, are, in their very nature, utterly antichristian. They may be invariably traced either to superstitious fear, or to unmixed selfishness. In the one case, they symbolize with the Papal Beast; in the other, with the Pagan. Both these cruel systems were sustained by Popular Ignorance: she was the pillar of their strength, and the nurse of their crimes. With the spirit of that religion which is emphatically Light and Love, we repeat it, they have no communion.

When God selected from the nations a people for himself, and in a peculiar sense became their Ruler and Head, he placed upon ignorance the seal of his reprobation; not only by charging the father to teach diligently to his children the Words of the Law, but also by providing an apparatus of means by which general knowledge might be diffused among the people. Without entering into any discussion respecting the precise duties of “the men of Issachar who had understanding of the times”, the character of “the schools of the prophets”, or the tradition of the Jews, that the men of the tribe of Simeon were generally employed as schoolmasters, and on this account dispersed among the other tribes,—it is perfectly safe to infer, from many incidental allusions in Scripture, that the mass of the Hebrew people were, in the best periods of their history, not less elevated above their idolatrous neighbours by their intelligence, than by their acquaintance with the true God. The Proverbs of the wise man, who spake, among other things, “of trees, from the cedar-tree that is in Lebanon, even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall, of beasts, of fowl, of creeping things, and of fishes,” were admirably fitted for *popular* instruction. Indeed, it is expressly said, “he taught *the people* knowledge”; and there can be no reasonable doubt, that, in his time, the Hebrews were a more generally enlightened people than any other nation of antiquity. We need not refer, in proof, to the moral and intellectual condition of the lower orders under Greek or Roman rule. Every reader of history is aware, that it was most debased. Humanity shudders at

the degradation of a Greek Helot. What could the instructions of the Academy effect for a class who were regarded, both by Stoics and Epicureans, as little better than the beasts? A Roman slave ranked no higher. He was literally a domestic animal: provision was made for his bodily wants, but none whatever for his spiritual. Of Atticus, indeed, it is recorded, that he possessed a learned household; every footboy in his family was trained to read and write for him. But then it was a distinction which rendered him remarkable above all the men of his times. In his case, too, the object appears to have been, (as indeed he tells his friend Cicero,) that he might employ these people in copying, for his own library, or for sale, the writings of the best authors, rather than with any view to the benefit of his servants.

The entrance of God's Word alone *diffused* light. Benevolent, expansive, and elevating, Christianity blessed alike the beggar and the prince; its torch illuminated with equal ray the cottage and the palace; and its sparks, wherever they fell, kindled at the same time, and often in equal degrees, a flame of intelligence and holiness. Thus, intellectually as well as spiritually, the revelation of Christ proved the light of the world; and they who rejected Him, remained in darkness.

In every subsequent age, the interests of popular education have been inseparable from those of spiritual Christianity: When the barbarous hordes of the north, like an overflowing flood, desolated Christendom, they made war not less against learning than against religion. The Dragon who cast them out of his mouth, viewed each with little short of equal hatred. During the long reign of Antichrist, literature shared the fate of the Gospel. At one time, it took refuge under its wing in the monastery: at another, they wandered in company, in dens and caves of the earth. At the Reformation, they rose from the dust together; and ever since, with some melancholy exceptions, they have fought side by side the glorious battles of Truth and Righteousness.

Of late years, indeed, attempts have been made to sever religion and learning, under the pretext, forsooth, of avoiding polemics. But this atheistic neutrality cannot be maintained. All attempts at elevating the national character without the help of Christianity, will fail. Apart from the influences of religion, the bulk of the community can never be raised above sensual pleasures; nor can either learning or liberty be long preserved. This simple truth is every day becoming more evident; and it is plain, that freedom, learning, and religion must stand or fall together. With these views, we rejoice in every fresh attempt to diffuse the elements of useful knowledge among the people.

A few brief notices of the various endeavours which have been



made, at different periods of our history, to promote popular education in England, may not be uninteresting to our readers. Alfred the Great appears to have been the first person who ever set vigorously about the task of introducing the elements of learning among the English people. He complains that, on his accession, he knew not one person south of the Thames, who could so much as interpret the Service Book, and very few in the northern parts who had even reached that pitch of erudition. To remedy the evil, he established schools every where, for the instruction of all classes, and enjoined by law 'all freeholders, 'possessed of two hydes of land or more', to send their children to them for instruction. Not content with this, he himself undertook to supply with books the schools he had opened, either by furnishing original compositions, or by making translations from the Greek; in each case seeking to convey instruction, not so much in the way of didactic essay, as by parables, stories, and apophthegms, at one time clothed in plain prose, at another couched in poetry. The civil dissensions which broke out at his death, put an early end to these excellent designs.

From this time down to the Reformation, we seek in vain for any extended movement in favour of general education. Schools, it is true, were in some cases carried on in the monasteries. From Stow's Survey of London it appears, that 'there were 'three principal ones' belonging to the churches of the metropolis in the time of King Stephen; but whether they were schools for the poor, in the present acceptation of the word, may reasonably be doubted. At this time, all Europe was overshadowed by that "thick darkness" which, "like the smoke of a great furnace", the inspired Seer beheld in his vision, "ascending out of the bottomless pit", and "filling the kingdom of the Beast." Rich and poor, the noble and the slave, alike bore the mark of debasement "on their right hand or on their foreheads." It was an age of gloomy and besotted superstition; and England partook of the character of the times.

At the Reformation, a new era may be said to have commenced. No sooner had the doctrines of the Reformed Faith struck their roots deeply into those States of Europe which now became professedly Protestant, than with one accord they began to make suitable provision for the religious education of their youth. Holland, Geneva, Switzerland, and Scotland, vied with each other in the good work of providing schools of elementary instruction for their whole population. Ignorance was then universally recognized as the enemy of Divine Truth, and, at the same time, was wisely deemed one of the greatest of political evils. Had the life of Edward the Sixth been spared but a few years longer, England would probably have been saved from the disgrace of being for centuries the only Protestant country in which



elementary education was not taken up as a great public duty. The Reformers themselves were by no means insensible to its importance; on the contrary, frequent indications of a feeling in favour of educating the poor may be traced in their writings. The Homilies of the Established Church, published by authority, contain strong admonitions to 'serving men,' to 'get good learning.' Private endowments for schools were every where encouraged; and charters were freely granted with a view to their security and permanence. Still, the good work languished; and it was not till above a century after the shackles of Popery had been thrown aside, that Cranmer's wish for 'grammar schools to be founded in every shire of England,' began to take effect. It is certain, that, in the times of the Commonwealth, a considerable portion of the people could both read and write. The civil wars would doubtless occasion the suspension of many of these establishments; and the atrocious policy followed by the Stuart family after the Restoration, would effectually prevent their being re-organized. It excites no surprise, therefore, to find that, in the reign of Queen Anne, 'the notorious ignorance and viciousness of the working classes' began seriously to attract public attention, and that many benevolent persons were desirous of establishing charity schools. In the *Spectator* of February, 1712, there is a paper on this subject; in which these schools are spoken of, as 'the greatest instances of public spirit the age has produced.' A writer in the *Guardian* of the following year, indulges in the expectation, that the 'next generation' would 'scarcely present a single instance of a child unable to read and write, and unacquainted with the principles of the Christian faith.' We shall shortly have occasion to see how far these expectations have been fulfilled. Since then, a hundred and twenty years have rolled away. We cannot stop to trace our way through them. Those who may be desirous of minutely investigating the moral and intellectual condition of the lower orders of Englishmen during that time, will find various sources of information open to them. The journals of Whitefield and Wesley will throw light on the state of things in their day; and the records of the Special Commissions of 1831, together with the recent report of the Commissioners on the Poor Laws, will serve to illustrate that in our own. England may thus be compared at different periods of her history; and the advancement or deterioration of the popular mind at particular seasons, be in some degree ascertained.

We need not discuss the various causes which have united to render old endowments in favour of education so signally inefficient. The labours of the Commissioners for inquiring into abuses connected with Public Charities, are partially before the public:—we trust the time is not far distant, when some practical

good will be attained by the investigation. It is disgraceful, that trustees should be permitted, for the sake of securing emoluments, to teach nothing but Latin and Greek to a few select pupils, where the donors of the funds have distinctly prescribed the education of the lower classes, of persons not having the means of common sustentation, nay, of parish paupers. The mild correctives of legislative wisdom must surely be applied before long to such monstrous evils.

From the times to which we have just referred, down to the year 1798, the spirit of slumber seems to have settled upon the country with regard to popular education. Sunday Schools had, indeed, for some years been extensively established in various parts of the kingdom, and, in detached situations, were carried on with various degrees of success; but, as they were then chiefly taught by hired teachers, most of them were miserably conducted. Still, a certain portion of good was done. As early as the year 1787, the Sunday School Society were able to report, that 'the schools were well attended; that the scholars not only learned to read, but that their general behaviour was improved, and that the very neighbourhood in which such schools were established, exhibited examples of decency, regularity, and security, to which they had long been unaccustomed.' It was not till the beginning of the present century, that gratuitous teachers fairly took out of the hands of the hireling, this "work of faith and labour of love."

About the year 1798, the spirit of private adventure, sustained by Christian philanthropy, once more awakened public attention to existing deficiencies in our system of popular instruction. Joseph Lancaster, with all his faults certainly an extraordinary man, now first began to publish those plans of education which, with various modifications, under the name of the Monitorial System, have since been carried into effect in every part of the civilized world. How far he was justified in laying claim to originality in his schemes, and in demanding to be recognized as the inventor of a new system of education, is of little moment. It would certainly have been wiser, had he been content with the far higher honour of being an instrument in the hands of Providence, by whose means the blessings of Scriptural instruction were brought within the reach of thousands, perhaps millions, who would otherwise have been left in the depths of ignorance. The British and Foreign School Society arose out of this movement; and sustained by Christian benevolence, it has ever since been exerting, in proportion to its means, a most beneficial influence in every region of the globe.

We do not know that there would be any impropriety in saying, that Lancaster was also the founder of "the National Society established for promoting the Education of the Poor in the prin-

ciples of the Established Church." It certainly would never have existed, but for the jealousy excited by the success of his labours. Its sectarian and exclusive regulations sufficiently indicate the spirit of its founders. Every child is obliged, on pain of expulsion, to learn the formularies of the Establishment, and is expected to attend the parish church, 'unless such reasons be assigned for non-attendance as are satisfactory to the persons having the direction of the school.' No religious tracts may be used in the schools, but such as are contained in the catalogue of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge. This institution, since its establishment, has divided with the British and Foreign School Society the patronage of the public.

Our readers are already familiar with the praiseworthy attempt of Mr. Brougham (at that time a distinguished member of the Lower House) to introduce a general system of National Education. We need not, therefore, bestow more than a passing allusion upon that extraordinary measure. The merits of the Bill were, at the time, amply discussed in our pages \*. Its failure, which greatly mortified the eminent person by whom it had been prepared at no ordinary expense of time and labour, was attributable entirely to the relative position of the Established Church and Dissent, whose conflicting interests no amount of skill could avail to reconcile. In 1826, the Bill was again brought forward, but shortly afterwards was quietly withdrawn.

After this abortive effort, no further attempt was made to agitate the question of a National provision for Education. The two Societies were left to pursue their respective operations undisturbed; and the country, hearing nothing further about parliamentary interference, settled quietly into the opinion, that the educational necessities of its population were fully met. In the Companion to the Almanack published by the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge in 1829, this absurdity was gravely attempted to be proved. The Writer, after giving a digest of the returns made to parliament in the year 1818, and comparing it with a similar return made in 1828, comes to the conclusion, that 'no very large portion of the children of the working population are now wanting the means of instruction.' He says: 'Since the date of these returns (those of 1818), a period of ten years, the most extraordinary exertions' (what extraordinary nonsense!) 'have been used to promote the education of the people. In the great work of teaching the children of the poor the principles of religion, and the elements of useful knowledge, all parties and persuasions have united with the most charitable zeal. The belief that universal education can have any injurious

---

\* See *Eclectic Review*, 2d Series, Vol. XV., pp. 193 *et seq.*; 290; and 359.



‘ effects upon the welfare of the community, is now happily exploded; and we have the satisfaction of believing that there are very few districts in England where the children of the working classes may not now obtain instruction.’ The fallacy of these statements is well exposed in the last Number of the *Edinburgh Review*. The data on which the whole conclusion rests, is shewn to be ‘ to the last degree vague and unsatisfactory;’ and an opinion is risked, that ‘ the strenuous exertions of the two Societies have scarcely kept pace with the increase of population during the last ten years.’ This, we doubt not, will be found to be the truth of the matter. The condition of the agricultural districts is stated, in the Report of the British and Foreign School Society for 1831, to be most distressing.

‘ Debasing ignorance prevails to an extent which could not be credited, were it not verified by the closest investigation. The facts which have been elicited respecting the moral and intellectual state of those counties which have been disgraced by riots and acts of incendiarism, are truly affecting, and yet they are but a fair representation of the actual state of our peasantry. We call ourselves an enlightened nation, an educated people; and yet, out of nearly *seven hundred* prisoners put on trial in four counties, upwards of *two hundred and sixty* were as ignorant as the savages of the desert;—they could not read a single letter. Of the whole *seven hundred*, only *one hundred and fifty* could write, or even read with ease; and (in the words of one of the chaplains to the gaols) nearly the whole number were totally ignorant with regard to the nature and obligations of true religion.’

Surely the worthy chaplain who made this frank confession, must have blushed as he wrote, at the signal proof it afforded of the inefficiency, even as a system of ‘ spiritual police,’ of that Establishment of which he was a minister.

On first reading the statement we have quoted, it struck us as a little extravagant, to say that these men were ‘ as ignorant as savages;’ but a little reflection convinced us that the similitude was adopted in sober sadness. We do not know whether a North American Indian might not with reason complain of the comparison. He ranks *higher* in the scale of intelligent being, than such miserable paupers as, in the year 1830, crowded the prisons of Christian England.

Further proof of the inadequacy of existing means for the instruction of the people, is furnished in the Reports of the same Society for 1832–3. We shall quote only one or two.

‘ In September last (1831), out of fifty prisoners put on trial at Bedford, only four could read. In the month of January (1833), there were in the same prison between fifty and sixty awaiting their trials, of whom not more than ten could read, and even some of these could not make out the sense of a sentence, though they knew their letters. At Wisbeach, in the Isle of Ely, it appears from a memorandum



on the calendar, of a kind which ought to be affixed to every similar document, that, of nineteen prisoners put on trial, only six were able to read and write; and it is added, the capital offences were committed entirely by persons in a state of the most debasing ignorance.'

These statements, resting as they do on authenticated documents, furnish melancholy proof, that, in spite of all the charitable zeal brought to bear on the instruction of the people, ignorance, like a pestilence, still spreads itself over the land.

With these facts before us, we were not a little surprised to find sentiments expressive of a contrary opinion, put into the mouth of the Lord Chancellor, by the Times Newspaper of March 14th of the present year. His Lordship, in rising to move for certain returns connected with the subject of Education, is stated to have given, among others, the following reasons for not again bringing forward the measure relative to Popular Education, which he introduced into the House of Commons when he was a member of that assembly. 'It appeared from returns made prior to 1820, 'that there existed in England and Wales a considerable number 'of endowed and unendowed schools, in addition to Sunday 'schools for the education of poor children; but these establishments were by no means adequate to the wants of the country, 'inasmuch as they furnished the means of education to only 'about 600,000, or 700,000 children. It was then thought, by 'some of the best friends of Education who had investigated the 'subject, that it was not advisable to establish a compulsory rate 'for the support of schools, lest those benevolent persons who 'then, by voluntary contributions, maintained 14,000 unendowed 'day schools, at which 478,000 children were educated, should 'withdraw their support from those establishments. Nevertheless 'he, (Lord Brougham,) in common with many other persons, was 'of opinion that a compulsory rate should be established, for the 'purposes of Education; and for this reason,—that the support 'which schools received from voluntary subscriptions was of a 'temporary, fluctuating, and fleeting nature; so that not only 'might it vary in one year as compared with another, but it might 'utterly pass away.'—These were the grounds on which the Bill of 1820 was brought forward. The cause of its rejection then, and of its subsequent withdrawal after a second introduction in 1826, have already been stated. 'In 1828,' (his Lordship is said to have observed,) 'a new era opened with respect to the Dissenters. In that year, the repeal of the Test and Corporation 'Acts removed the distinction which had previously divided his 'Majesty's subjects into churchmen and dissenters; and it then 'appeared to him, that the objections which the latter body had 'formerly entertained to his bill, would be removed.'

If Lord Brougham really made these observations, (and we see no reason to doubt it,) we have before us another very striking

instance of the utter ignorance which prevails with respect to the views and feelings of Dissenters, even among those who have had every opportunity of being well informed. What a strange supposition! The objections of the Dissenters to a Bill which went to throw the government of the common schools of the country almost exclusively into the hands of the clergy of the Established Church, are removed,—because the Test and Corporation Acts were repealed!! Surely his Lordship could not be serious when he made (if he did make) this most ludicrous assumption.

Leaving this, however, let us follow his Lordship a little further. 'It also occurred to him, that it would be most material to endeavour to ascertain, whether the voluntary support which was given to schools in this country was of so fluctuating and fleeting a nature as he had supposed. In order to satisfy his mind upon this point, he addressed, in his individual capacity, about 500 letters to clergymen in every county in the kingdom, requesting information on the subject of the schools in their respective parishes. To these letters, which were addressed quite at random, he received nearly as many answers; and the information which they contained was highly gratifying. The result shewed that, whereas in 1818 there were in the whole kingdom, as he had already stated, 14,000 unendowed day schools, educating 478,000 children, in 1828 there were, in the particular places to which he had addressed his letters alone, no less than 3200 schools of this description, educating 105,000 children. Taking these places as affording a fair sample of the rest of the kingdom, as he had a right to do from the manner in which he had addressed his circulars, the result would be, that there were 230,000' (we suppose this is a typographical error for 32,000, as reported in the *Morning Chronicle*) 'unendowed day schools, educating 1,030,000 children, all supported by voluntary subscription; independently of the endowed schools which educated 165,000, and of the Sunday schools, which furnished very useful and salutary education, though necessarily of inferior importance to that which could be obtained from day schools.'

Very little attention to these calculations will suffice to shew the utter fallacy of this reasoning; and we cannot but wonder that a man of Lord Brougham's sagacity should have allowed himself to have been so grievously misled. Because 500 parishes report double the number of children they did in 1818, therefore 10,000 parishes have twice as many children under instruction as they had ten years ago:—that is the argument.

It will be shortly seen, that we are inclined to dispute alike both the premises and the conclusion. On turning to the last Report of the National Society, we find that, after sending circulars to every parish church and chapelry in the kingdom, in number about 12,000, under favour of a free cover, by which the funds of

the Society were relieved from the expense of postage, the account being, as they state, carried to considerable perfection, and returns received from 9309 places, they are yet only able to report 6,470 day schools with 409,000 scholars. And these, be it remembered, include, by their own shewing, ALL the old endowed schools;—in fact, every school in the kingdom in which children of the poor are instructed under the care or control of the Established Church. We think it quite fair to conclude, that, had the 2013 parishes from which no reports were received, possessed schools, they would not have failed to swell a list, which was evidently prepared, at the cost of immense labour, for the purpose of shewing how large a proportion of the population are educated by the clergy. Well then, let our readers bear in mind, we have as yet only found, including all the old endowed schools,—antiquated nurseries, for the most part, of pharisaism and obsequious dependence,—6470 schools with 409,000 pupils; and of these, not even one half are conducted on the system of the National Society. The British and Foreign School Society, unfavoured by free covers, have not been able to obtain a correct list of schools established on their system. They do not, however, estimate them at more than 600 or 800, with from 60,000 to 80,000 children. Now, as these two added together, do not give a total of more than 7,200 schools, with not quite 500,000 scholars, we would humbly ask, where the remaining 25,000!! schools, *supported by voluntary subscription*, with their half million of children, are to be found?—The fact is,—as any one may see, who chooses to take the trouble of turning over a few pages of the digest of parochial returns,—the 14,000 schools reported in 1818, included all the little dame-schools, as well as cheap private day schools of every description; and *these* are all doubled in the notable calculation of 32,000 schools and 1,030,000 children; while, to complete the delusion, no allowance whatever is made for the increase of population. The error is two-fold. First, the calculation assumes, that private schools have increased in an equal ratio with public ones; and then, that the number of children needing instruction is the same as it was in 1818. Now, with regard to the first of these suppositions, it should be remembered, that, in almost every instance, the opening of a National Lancastrian school brings to the ground a certain number of cheap private day schools, for which, in all reason, some allowance ought to be made. We could point out cases in which the opening of a public school, inadequately supported, and afterwards allowed to fall, has absolutely done mischief. The second omission is too flagrant to need notice. Miss Martineau's alarm is indeed needless, if we make no material advance in ten years. Why, if calculations like these were correct, and, in addition to 32,000 schools supported by voluntary subscription, were to be reckoned



all the endowed and private schools, and all the sunday schools of the Dissenters, as well as those conducted on that day only in connexion with the Established Church,—England, instead of being one of the worst, would be one of the best educated countries in Europe. In this case, we should never have found that, ‘out of 700 prisoners put on trial in four counties in 1831, only 150 could read with ease’; that, ‘out of 41,017 individuals visited by the committee of the Herefordshire Auxiliary Bible Society in 1830, only 24,222 possessed that invaluable attainment’; and that, in a village not 50 miles from London, inspected only a few months ago, ‘out of 1467 persons visited, upwards of 900 were totally ignorant of letters.’ That we *have* found things thus, is the best proof of the fallacy of the statements on which we have thought it right thus freely to animadvert. How Lord Brougham (for whom we entertain the most unfeigned respect) can ever have been brought to sanction such delusive arithmetic, we are at a loss to imagine. Yet, it is on grounds like these, his Lordship is made to state, ‘that he became a convert to the opinions of those who thought it would be unwise to disturb a state of things which produced such admirable results.’

His Lordship, however, still considers the means of education to be ‘defective in two points.’ ‘In the first place, they were defective in small parishes. There were 500 parishes’ (according to the report given in the Chronicle 1500) ‘in which no schools existed at all. This was owing to the parishes being small in size and of limited population. In many of them, there were not more than thirty or forty families. It was evident that, however perfect the system of education might be, the inhabitants of such districts must depend upon private means for instruction.’

Now, we are willing to take either report, and let the number of destitute parishes stand at 500 or at 1500; and in either case we would ask,—Does Lord Brougham really believe that this is the entire number of parishes in which no provision is made for the education of the people, and that this destitution exists only in places where there is not sufficient population to maintain a school? We cannot bring ourselves to suppose that he is so deluded. But then, why has he not contradicted statements sent forth to the world under the sanction of his name?

In the remarks we have thus thought it right to make, we have said little or nothing as to the *character* of the schools which do really exist. In every estimate of the provision actually made for the education of the people, this is a most important item; yet, it forms no part of Lord Brougham’s result! The returns of 1828, like those of 1818, dignify with the name of school, every miserable garret or hovel in which weakness or decrepitude ekes out a wretched subsistence by abusing the title of teacher; but



no deductions are made on this account. These swell the list; they form no inconsiderable part of the original fourteen thousand, and are all doubled by the rapid pen of the sanguine Chancellor.

But, putting the dame-schools out of sight, we would ask, what is the *quality* of the instruction afforded in the great majority of what are called national schools? We feel no scruple in describing it as most contemptible. Geography, grammar, history, the elements of geometry, nay, even the higher branches of arithmetic, are, in nearly all of them, forbidden; any thing like a vigorous exercise of the intellectual powers is discouraged *on principle*; and all religious instruction of a kind which does not accord with the semi-papistical notions of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, is, on principle too, disallowed. The ability to recite the catechism and the creed, with, perhaps, a collect and a prayer, is commonly the sum total of the religious attainments of the scholars.—Is this education? Is this the kind of education which the children of Englishmen ought to receive in the nineteenth century? Is any thing but matter of shame and regret to be found in the multiplication of such “old wives’” establishments for the instruction of youth?

We pass on to notice, as next in order, the introduction of a Bill for regulating the labour of children and young persons in the mills and factories of the United Kingdom. The *xxth* clause enacts, ‘that, from and after the expiration of six months ‘from the passing of this act, every child herein restricted to the ‘performance of forty-eight hours of labour in any one week, ‘shall, so long as such child shall be within the said restricting age, ‘attend some school, to be chosen by the parents or guardians of ‘such child, or such school as may be appointed by any inspector ‘in case the parents or guardians of such child shall omit to ‘appoint any school, or in case such child shall be without parents ‘or guardians; and it shall and may be lawful in such last mentioned case, for any inspector to order the employer of any such ‘child, to make a deduction from the weekly wages of such child ‘as the same shall become due, not exceeding the rate of one ‘penny in every shilling, to pay for the schooling of such child; ‘and such employer is hereby required to pay the sum so deducted, according to the order and direction of such inspector.’ The attendance of the child at school is secured by further clauses, requiring the production of ‘a schoolmaster’s ticket or voucher,’ every Monday morning, certifying regular attendance. Additional clauses enact, that ‘wherever it shall appear to any inspector, ‘that a new or additional school is necessary to enable the ‘children employed in any factory to obtain the education required by the act, such inspector is authorized to establish, or ‘procure the establishment of such school; and if, upon examina-

‘tion, any inspector shall be of opinion that any schoolmaster or schoolmistress is incompetent, or in any way unfit for the performance of the duties of that office, it shall be lawful for such inspector to disallow and withhold the order for any payment or salary to such schoolmaster or schoolmistress as hereinbefore provided.’

This is a great step in favour of Popular Education. It secures at once the instruction of a very large and neglected portion of the population, and cannot fail to be productive of the most beneficial results. The *principle* also on which the enactment proceeds, is important, viz. that the State has a right to *demand* the instruction of children. So far as the act in question extends, it not only provides the means of education, but compels the parent either to avail himself of the provision, or to shew that in some other way his child is reaping the benefit it offers to confer. How far compulsory enactments similar to those which have been acted upon so successfully in Prussia and elsewhere, might be advisable in any general measure, is a distinct question, and one which, from its importance, would not admit of hasty decision. We confess to a strong leaning in their favour. In the case of factory children, there can be no doubt of the expediency of insisting upon their instruction. Without such a clause, all other provision would have been nugatory.

We do not precisely see from what source funds are to be provided for the new schools that may be required; nor is any thing said as to the kind of school to be established. Every thing seems left in the hands of the inspector, whose power is certainly by no means limited. We should consider this as very loose and crude legislation, did we not look upon the incompleteness of the measure as an indication of the intention of Government, before long, to bring forward a general plan of a more specific character, under the regulations of which the factory schools are, we presume, intended to fall.

We come now to the recent grant of £20,000;—a vote which derives its importance, not from its amount, which is but trifling; but from the fact of its being *the first sum of money ever set apart by Parliament for the education of the English poor*. Our readers are aware, that it is to be devoted to the building of school-rooms, and, according to the speech of Lord Althorp, to be divided indifferently between the advocates of the two societies: that is to say, one half is to be bestowed on the erection of buildings exclusively for the instruction of the children of members of the Established Church;—the other half is—*for the nation*. As the grant is professedly a temporary expedient, or, as Lord Althorp termed it, ‘an experimental vote,’ perhaps it may be considered as scarcely open to criticism. We cannot, however, but decidedly object to any portion of the public money being voted in aid of

schools from which the children of all but one sect are systematically excluded. These are not times for Parliament to support what may very fairly be termed *the persecuting principle*. Dissenters are guilty of unpardonable negligence in allowing a shilling to be appropriated to such purposes without the most vigorous resistance. The period is gone by for this kind of imposition. The public mind only needs to be aroused by well directed agitation to the simple injustice on which all such unchristian monopolies are based, in order to ensure their abolition. Whenever this wholesome movement commences,—and it cannot be far distant,—the thread of their existence will be between the shears:—the indignant voice of an abused people will demand their extinction in terms which no Ministry can resist.

That, before long, something must and will be done on an extended scale for the education of the people, there can be no doubt. It is, therefore, highly important, that the Dissenters, as a body, should be prepared to state with distinctness and decision, what they will accept, and what they will oppose. The resources of private benevolence are confessedly inadequate to the task of bringing the schoolmaster to every man's door. In large towns, a great deal has undoubtedly been effected by enterprising and benevolent individuals; but, in villages and thinly scattered districts, comparatively little has been, or can be done. The difficulty of raising a sufficient sum to afford a decent maintenance for a respectable schoolmaster, is, in these situations, generally too great to be overcome without some compromise of principle. As a natural result, persons are frequently appointed to the office, whose only qualification is to be found in their deriving emolument from some other occupation, such as that of parish clerk or sexton, by the aid of which they are enabled to maintain themselves, and thus keep open the school doors. Now it is in cases like these, that the aid of Government is indispensably necessary. How it may be most effectually imparted, is an interesting and, as yet, an open question.

We should be decidedly inclined to advocate a general measure in preference to any partial expedients; but then it must be founded on just and liberal principles. It would be an act of suicide on the part of the Dissenters, to allow any Bill to be passed, which should throw the slightest additional power into the hands of the Established Church. On this point, they must be firm and united. The Edinburgh Reviewer affects to believe that no measure more favourable to the Dissenters than the Bill of 1820, could pass the House of Lords. If that be true, we may confidently predict, that no Bill will pass at all. Dissenters are bound to speak out on this subject; they have no sinister ends to answer, and they have a right to be bold and fearless. All they want is, a Bill which shall promote the daily instruction



of the children of the poor, '*on principles at once consistent with the rights of conscience and the claims of God*'; and less than this, we trust and believe they will never admit.

How this is to be accomplished,—by what provision this desirable object can be most effectually secured, is a question of much delicacy and difficulty. There is a great deal of truth in the remark of the Edinburgh Reviewer, that 'neither of the distinguished societies which have been working so long and so assiduously in promoting the education of the poorer classes, has yet adopted a course of instruction in exact accordance with what a system of NATIONAL EDUCATION ought to be.' But then the Reviewer should in justice have stated, that the plans of the one Society are contracted *on principle*; those of the other, *by necessity*. It is also unfair to say, that the British and Foreign School Society 'has relaxed from its exclusively religious spirit'. It never was *exclusively* religious. Its friends have never been so absurd, as to pretend that secular knowledge was unimportant. We are confident that the Committee of that institution would not wish to have their views on Education expressed in terms materially differing from those chosen by the Reviewer himself, to describe the views and feelings of the founders of the educational institutions of Scotland.

The statement which the Committee of the General Assembly have lately made, that, in their Highland schools, those in which the greatest variety of secular instruction is imparted, are most distinguished by a religious character, is one which we should have been quite prepared to expect. Man is distinguished from the brute, not less by improveable reason, than by the capacity for devotion; and these two are not opposed the one to the other. The more truly enlightened any man becomes,—the more his reasoning faculties expand and are purified by an enlarged acquaintance with external nature, the more *inexcusable* is he, if he remain unimpressed by the consideration of "things which are unseen and eternal." Irreligion is wilful stupidity: "the fool hath said in his heart, there is no God."

That other books besides the Bible might advantageously be introduced into elementary schools, we cheerfully concede; and the same concession, we doubt not, would at any time be made by the Committee of the British and Foreign School Society, although many circumstances may render it inexpedient for them to make the innovation. It is curious to observe, how ingeniously the want of other books for reading is supplied, in the model schools of the Society in question, by a carefully selected set of spelling lessons, through which a vast variety of secular knowledge is imparted to the children *orally* by the monitors, who, in turn, gain their information either from the master or from a well selected library, which is thrown open to their use out of school-



hours; so that while it is perfectly true, that no book but the Bible is *read* in the school, it is equally certain that many other books are *taught*. We do not mean to imply that there is any thing like disingenuousness in this proceeding: it simply shews how public opinion, we do not say compels, but *enables* them to keep in advance of their original constitution.

The formation of a committee of the most active and enlightened members of both Societies, for the purpose of selecting or preparing a series of reading lessons, as suggested by the Edinburgh Reviewer, is a matter for the consideration of the Government. We do not anticipate much difficulty with regard to lessons. A series which would be acceptable to all parties, might without doubt be easily prepared. Let them but be compiled under the remembrance of what the Edinburgh Reviewer properly terms the wise consideration, that children are not only 'doomed to act their part in the great community of mankind,' but destined to be subjects of a kingdom which is "not of this world," and the Christian public will be fully satisfied.

Whatever plan Parliament may resolve to pursue, must, however, in the main, be carried into effect irrespectively of any existing societies whatsoever. The best thing Government can do for voluntary associations is, to let them alone. The National and the British and Foreign School Societies will not necessarily fall to the ground, because legislative provision is made for elementary instruction. Each will continue, for a time at least, to enjoy the confidence and support of its respective friends; and if either of them can furnish a better or cheaper education than the Government commission, they will, and ought to be preferred. The British and Foreign School Society has of late years obtained a strong hold on the affections of intelligent and religious persons, in a department where the Government will find it exceedingly difficult to compete with them;—we mean, in the selection and training of teachers. Unlimited pecuniary resources may secure talent, but will never ensure piety; and in an elementary school, every practical man knows, that a very moderate share of ability, when united to religious zeal, will accomplish much more in the actual improvement of children, both literary and moral, than the most shining talent when unaccompanied by a hearty and disinterested love for the employment. Just as the 'ignorant sectary'—in other words, a plain, warm-hearted preacher of the Gospel—will often take hold on the affections, and elevate the character of a rural district, upon which collegiate attainments have been brought to bear in vain; so will a zealous and affectionate schoolmaster, though he may be quite guiltless of Latin or Greek, often succeed in casting far into the shade, his more accomplished, but less beloved competitor.

If the Committee of the British and Foreign School Society

will do their duty,—and we believe they will,—they may confer an incalculable benefit on the country, by turning their resources as much as possible towards the enlargement of their training establishment; they may then rival, in *moral* power at least, any institution for the instruction of teachers, which Government can maintain. We know that the selection and recommendation of teachers is a most thankless office; for the public are neither prepared to estimate its importance, nor to allow for its difficulties. In discriminating among the various characters which present themselves for notice, it is not easy to avoid collision with the injudicious friends of disappointed candidates, or to escape the suspicion of being sometimes governed by the love of power or the desire of patronage. But all this only renders it the more important, that such a service should be performed by men who look higher for their reward than the favour of princes or of people.

We are glad to find, from a recent publication of the Society, that a very good ground-work is already laid for such a *College of Schoolmasters*. Every candidate for a school under the Society, 'is placed as a monitor in each class of the school, and is expected 'to work his way, as a practical teacher, from the lowest to the 'highest form, proving his ability to *govern* by the maintenance 'of order in the central model school, whenever it may be placed 'under his control.' This discipline is simply intended to teach the student how *to communicate*, in the best possible way, that portion of knowledge which he already possesses. In order that he may obtain additional information, and thus improve his own mind, 'facilities are afforded, out of school hours, for the acquisition of various kinds of useful knowledge. Two hours every 'evening are devoted to Arithmetic, Geography, the Elements of 'Geometry, and History, under a master; one hour early in the 'morning to a Bible class; and two hours in the week to the 'Evidences of the Christian Religion. A good library is also 'provided, in which the best treatises on Education, as well as 'books on every branch of knowledge, are thrown open to the use 'of the candidates.' This is beginning at the right end; and such plans, if vigorously followed out, must prove highly beneficial to the country.

The importance of securing a faithful body of public teachers, appears now to be deeply felt everywhere. We observe in a New York paper, which has just come to hand, that, only a few weeks back, a public meeting of a highly respectable character was held in that city, at which Resolutions were passed, expressing an opinion that the common schools of that State were greatly deficient in good teachers, and appointing a Committee to memorialize the legislature, praying for the endowment, by the State, of a central institution for the education of teachers upon a scale

co-extensive with the public wants. Without this provision, no system of public instruction can ever be complete.

In addressing ourselves to the task of stating what should, in our view, form the leading features of any Bill for the universal establishment of elementary schools in England, we feel that we are treading upon delicate ground. A mere outline is all we shall offer. Having laid down certain general principles such as these—that the schools shall be open on equal terms to children of all religious denominations, and that no sectarian manual or church formulary be introduced, (without which provision, no plan can ever be acceptable to the country,)—we should say, that it would be well for Government to pursue some such course as this:—I. To appoint an efficient Board of Commissioners for the promotion of public education, composed of men whose known sentiments should be a sufficient guarantee that the rights of conscience would be respected. II. To establish, under the control of these Commissioners, six or eight good normal schools (*Ecoles normales*) in different parts of the country, in which facilities should be afforded for the proper education and training of teachers. III. To require each parish, either by itself or jointly with one or more neighbouring parishes, to erect within a limited time one or more school-houses, according to the extent of population; to provide out of the parish rate an amount of income towards the support of a teacher, which amount should be fixed by the Board of Commissioners; and to appoint, subject to re-election every three years, a committee or local board of education. The first and most important duty of the local board would be, the appointment of a teacher; subject, of course, to the approbation of the Government board, in one of whose normal schools he must be trained. We need scarcely add, that, in the choice of a teacher, there must be no further attempt to exclude Dissenters,—no more tests wide enough to admit the unprincipled and irreligious, narrow and exclusive only to the conscientious. Character and ability must alone be demanded. The regulation of fees to be paid to the master by the scholars, according to the ability of their parents and the extent of instruction they receive, will also, under certain limitations, naturally fall under the care of the local committee. The Government Board should then be invested with the power of visitation by Inspectors, and, in cases of incompetency, be authorized to require the immediate suspension or removal of the teacher by the local board.

With regard to the kind and amount of *literary* instruction to be given, we see no difficulty. It would be the duty of the Board of Commissioners to take care that it was of the most useful kind, and imparted in the most approved manner. We would say, let all be done ‘on the most liberal and comprehensive footing; no



‘branch of knowledge, ancient or modern, being excluded, which the master could teach, and the parents might desire for their children.’ The impartation of religious knowledge is a more difficult question. We believe that the country generally would be satisfied with the reverential and intelligent reading of the Bible for two hours every day by all the children who were able to do it with propriety. The Catholics and Jews might be excepted, wherever the parent expressed a wish to that effect. To set apart particular portions of time, during which ministers of different denominations might attend to their respective flocks, would, we fear, be quite useless. The introduction of any catechism is objectionable, apart from the inefficiency of such a mode of instruction. The best “form of sound words,” repeated as a daily task, soon becomes a mere form of words, and ceases to impress either the intellect or the heart. The formularies of any church, we have already shewn, can never be admitted. We would say, therefore, Give us the Bible,—the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, for ‘the Bible is the religion of Protestants.’

A very little consideration will suffice to shew, that the *real* amount of religious instruction communicated in any school will depend upon the character of the teacher. If he be a man “fearing God and working righteousness,” the school will in some measure be imbued with his character and spirit. If he be a “scorner,” he “will delight himself in scorning.” It is absurd to talk of irreligious men imparting religious instruction, either from the pulpit or the desk. “Doth a fountain send forth at the same place sweet water and bitter? Can the fig-tree bear olive-berries? either a vine figs? So can no fountain both yield salt water and fresh.” In the case we have supposed, an additional responsibility would lie upon Sabbath-school teachers. Relieved, as they would in great measure be, from the drudgery of elementary teaching, a more decidedly religious character would be imparted to their instructions; older and more experienced Christians would, we trust, come forward to their assistance; and schools of Sabbath instruction would be emphatically, the Nurseries of the Church.

We had intended to give a brief account of the law regarding Education in Prussia, as well as a short digest of the French ‘*Projet de Loi*,’ but the length to which this article has already extended, forbids the attempt. We shall conclude, therefore, with a few words of advice to Christians of all denominations who love and cherish a catholic spirit.

Government will, before long, take decisive steps in favour of Popular Education. Let their first movements then be carefully watched. It is not to be concealed, that two parties—factions we might term them—are already busily engaged in seeking to obtain the ear of the ministry on this important subject. The one is

willing to stake religion itself on the chance of securing by a bold stroke the introduction of the formularies of their church:—the other, under the pretext of avoiding polemics, is anxious to dispense altogether with the Bible and religious instruction. If the latter party should succeed,—and this is not impossible,—they will owe their success to the obstinate bigotry of their reverend opponents. Priestly domination is always the parent of infidelity and irreligion. We are confident, however, that the good sense and piety of the country are equally opposed to each of these schemes. We appeal from both, to plain Christian principle,—to men who love their Bible better than their creed, their country better than their party. We entreat such, as they value Divine truth and Christian liberty, to awake and to unite. There is no time to lose. The ground must be occupied without a moment's delay; and the Parliament and the Government must be alike made to feel, that the British people have yet piety enough remaining amongst them to maintain the faith, and spirit enough to resist and to prevent any encroachment upon their religious liberties.

Above all, let the Dissenters beware of a spirit of apathy with regard to the public instruction of the people. It is a matter of surpassing moment to them. The day in which we live, is pregnant with events, the precise character and bearing of which no mortal can divine. It becomes us to cherish, not a spirit of exultation, but of prayer;—to be found, not lulled in fancied security, but with our “loins girded and our lamps burning.” The ‘conflict of great principles,’ which, all parties agree, is coming on, will be severe and searching. To be faithful throughout, will require many unexpected and painful sacrifices. A time of “plucking up” is not less trying to faith and love, than a time of “planting.” For the result we have no fears. “The Lord God omnipotent reigneth.” Let us but be true to our principles, and our children and our children's children will reap the benefit.

---

Art. II.—THE CONGREGATIONAL LECTURE. First Series. *Christian Ethics*; or Moral Philosophy on the Principles of Divine Revelation. By Ralph Wardlaw, D.D. 8vo. pp. xvi. 416. Price 10s. 6d. London, 1833.

TO a large proportion of our readers, the occasion upon which this course of lectures was delivered, cannot be unknown. The public-spirited founders of the Congregational Library for the use of the orthodox Dissenters in the metropolis, conceived that it would advance the important object of that Institution, ‘the promotion of ecclesiastical, theological, and biblical literature,’—to connect with it ‘a Lecture, partaking of the cha-

‘racter of Academic prelections, rather than of popular addresses, and embracing a series of annual courses of lectures, to be delivered at the Library, or, if necessary, in some contiguous place of worship.’

‘To illustrate the evidence and importance of the great doctrines of Revelation ; to exhibit the true principles of philology in their application to such doctrines ; to prove the accordance and identity of genuine philosophy with the records and discoveries of Scripture ; and to trace the errors and corruptions which have existed in the Christian Church to their proper sources ; and, by the connexion of sound reasoning with the honest interpretation of God’s holy word, to point out the methods of refutation and counteraction ; are amongst the objects for which “the Congregational Lecture” has been established.’

In the selection of Lecturers, it is proposed to appoint such individuals of the Congregational denomination as, ‘by their literary attainments and ministerial reputation, have rendered service to the cause of Divine truth, in the consecration of their talents to the “defence and confirmation of the Gospel.”’ Dr. Wardlaw modestly states, that he owes his being appointed to deliver the first series, to the circumstance of his learned and excellent friend, the Rev. Dr. John Pye Smith, having found it necessary, from special engagements, to decline accepting of it. The Lecture could not, however, have been commenced under more favourable auspices. As to the lecturer, Dr. Wardlaw, as an author, may be regarded as standing at the head of his denomination in Scotland ; and the subject he has chosen, if not strictly popular, is treated in a manner at once so Scriptural and so practical, as to render the volume a very suitable commencement of a series intended to harmonize genuine philosophy with the doctrines and discoveries of Holy Scripture. A sentence which occurs in the introductory lecture, might serve as a general motto to the volume, and indeed to the whole series : ‘It is only false philosophy that fears Revelation, or that Revelation has to fear.’

The present volume contains a course of nine lectures, the first of which was delivered on Tuesday, April 30th, before a highly respectable auditory, at the Congregational Library ; and the last on Tuesday, May 30th. The second course is to be delivered in the ensuing Spring, by the Rev. Robert Vaughan, the recently appointed Professor of Modern History in the London University.

We know not why Dr. Wardlaw should have thought it needful to apologize for the title of his volume, as presumptuous, or as holding out the promise of more than it performs ; but it will be proper to give his own explanation.

‘He wishes it to be regarded as strictly and exclusively *elementary*,—having for its design, to investigate and ascertain principles, not at



all to unfold the details of duty, or to furnish a practical commentary on the commandments. Had not the title, indeed, been formally announced in the opening of the first lecture, he would now have been disposed to modify it to—*Elements of Moral Philosophy on the Principles of Divine Revelation.*

It seems to us, that the modified title promises more, and is far more comprehensive, than the one which stands on the title-page. Ethics, 'the science of manners' or social duty, is properly a branch only of Moral Philosophy, which must necessarily include also the science of religious duty, or theology, the science of political duty, or natural law, and what may be properly distinguished as political science. Paley, indeed, tells us, that Moral Philosophy, Morals, Natural Law, Casuistry, and Ethics, all mean the same thing; and it is true, that all these terms are vaguely used as almost convertible, but with no propriety. We lay little stress, in such inquiries, upon technical definitions. It cannot, however, be a matter absolutely indifferent, whether we call a part by the name of the whole, and suffer that pretended science to appropriate the name and occupy the whole field of moral philosophy, which forms, in fact, but a subordinate and dependent inquiry; or rather, as frequently prosecuted, an arbitrary method of investigation, based upon false assumptions, and limited to a certain class of facts, which cannot even be rightly understood, apart from other facts, to which they are essentially related as cause or effect. In other words, moral philosophy must include theology, so far as the latter is a science based upon facts: by disregarding those facts, it becomes as necessarily false as a system of natural philosophy would be, that should exclude any of the great physical facts relating to the constitution of material nature.

The writer of the article Moral Philosophy in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, gives the following statement of the specific nature of that science, which is cited by Dr. Wardlaw as presenting a clear view of the fallacious principle that forms the radical error of all theories of morals.

“Moral Philosophy has this in common with natural philosophy, that it appeals to nature, or to fact; depends on observation; and builds its reasonings on plain, uncontroverted experiments, or upon the fullest induction of particulars of which the subject will admit. We must observe, in both these sciences, how nature is affected, and what her conduct is in such and such circumstances; or, in other words, we must collect the appearances of nature in any given instance, trace them to some given principles or terms of operation, and then apply these principles or laws to the explaining of other phenomena. Therefore, moral philosophy inquires, not how man might have been, but how he is, constituted; not into what principles and dispositions his actions may be artfully resolved, but from what principles and

dispositions they actually flow ; not what he may, by education, habit, or foreign influence, come to be, or to do, but what, by his nature, or original constituent principles, he is formed to be and to do. We discover the office, use, or distinction of any work, whether natural or artificial, by observing its structure, the parts of which it consists, their connexion, or joint action. It is thus we understand the office and use of a watch, a plant, an eye, or a hand. It is the same with a living creature of the rational or brute kind. Therefore, to determine the office, duty, or distinction of man, or, in other words, what his business is, or what conduct he is obliged to pursue, we must inspect his constitution, take every part to pieces, examine their mutual relations one to the other, and the common effect or tendency of the whole.”

According to this statement, Dr. Wardlaw remarks, ‘ we are ‘ to pursue our investigations in morals, as we do our researches ‘ in physics.’ This is in itself an absurdity. Not only so ; the theory requires, that we regard the present moral constitution of man, indicated by its various phenomena, as being in all respects the work of Deity, as really as the structure of his corporal frame ; ‘ so that, from the observation of man as he is, we ‘ are to learn the moral character of Deity, and the principles of ‘ rectitude, as existing in his nature, and approved under his government, in the same way in which we discover his intelligence ‘ and wisdom from the marks of skill in the material universe.’ ‘ This of course,’ adds Dr. W., ‘ proceeds on the assumption, ‘ that man as he now is, is what he was originally made, and was ‘ designed by his Maker to continue to be.’ But such assumption, being not merely unproved and unsusceptible of proof ; but contradicted by indications which receive their only adequate explanation from the testimony of Scripture, must communicate the character of error to the whole chain of dependent observations and reasonings. Nor is this the only false assumption involved in the theory. It supposes that the mental apparatus of observation and judgement by which the facts embraced by moral philosophy are to be investigated, is as fully adapted to the discovery of truth, as the senses are to ascertain the physical qualities of material objects ;—that the moral sense is as true in its perceptions of right and wrong, as the eye of the anatomist or chemist is in detecting the results of dissection or analysis ;—that, in moral investigations, as in physical, the intellectual faculty alone is concerned in the ascertainment of truth, and is competent by its own light to make the discovery. Now if moral philosophers confined their speculations to purely intellectual phenomena,—to those facts and appearances which belong to the physiology of the human mind,—less error and less presumption would be involved in their assuming the moral integrity of human nature. The study of the mind, or what is now distinguished by the name of Intellectual Philosophy, either ranks among physical sciences, or

it does not. If it does, it has nothing to do with ethics; it is no part of its office to ascertain or determine the *duty* of man; the questions of causation, of free-will, of moral obligation, have no more to do with the physiology of mind, than with comparative anatomy. But if it does not rank under natural philosophy or physics, the laws and processes of physical investigation cannot apply to it; and to make it 'depend upon observation' is purely absurd.

Moral philosophy, however, it may be said, is a mixed science: it treats partly of what is, and is so far physical; partly of what ought to be, which belongs to metaphysics, or rather to morals. Justly it has been remarked by one of the most philosophic writers of the day, that 'there never would have been occasion to affirm 'the independence of physics and metaphysics, were it not that 'the immemorial practice of confounding the science of the human mind with pure abstractions, has filled both departments of 'intellectual philosophy with absurdity, and has detained both, 'to the present day, in a state of infancy.'\* The purpose of the physical sciences, throughout all their provinces, is, we have been told, to answer the question, *What is?* That of the moral sciences is, to answer the question, *What ought to be?* But even as to what *is*, a distinction must be made, as wide as the interval between the respective provinces of Physical and Moral Science,—a distinction between physical existence and moral condition,—between being and well-being, between the bare fact of what is, and the real character of actual existences. Now, of the *moral* character of what is, it is evident that no correct judgement can be formed without reference to what ought to be. Admitting that will, action, habit, disposition, are terms denoting facts in human nature, an explanation of which must be sought in mental philosophy, we cannot pronounce the will to be virtuous or the contrary, an action to be morally good or bad, a disposition to be right or depraved, without passing at once the boundary of physical inquiries, and including, in our affirmation of what is, a belief of what ought to be. It is then evident that an attempt to determine what ought to be, by a simple induction from existing phenomena, is as unphilosophical as it is irreligious. It is not only inverting the process by which the moral sense can alone discern good from evil, but it goes far towards reducing vice and virtue, right and wrong, to mere physical distinctions.

Moral philosophy has almost avowedly been the antagonist of Theology. It is, at least, an attempt to do without Revelation in the science of Morals. Writers who have not themselves ranked among disbelievers, have apparently essayed to construct

---

\* Introductory Essay to Edwards on the Will.



ethical systems independent of the facts and discoveries of Revelation, out of compliment to an infidel philosophy. The amiable Dugald Stewart does not stand clear from this grave charge. Dr. Wardlaw has pointed out a flagrant instance of the sanction which he has given to the radical error of the philosophic systems.

‘The late Dugald Stewart quotes, with high approbation, the following sentiment of Melanchthon, where, in the language of the philosopher, that reformer “combats the pernicious and impious tenets of those theologians who maintained, that moral distinctions are created entirely by the arbitrary revealed will of God:”—“Wherefore, our decision is this; that those precepts which learned men have committed to writing, transcribing them from the common sense and common feelings of human nature, are to be accounted as not less divine, than those contained in the tables given to Moses; and that it could not be the intention of our Maker to supersede, by a law graven on a stone, that which is graven with his own finger on the table of the heart.”—“This language,” says the commentator, “was, undoubtedly, an important step towards a just system of moral philosophy. But still, like the other steps of the reformers, it was only a return to common sense, and to the genuine spirit of Christianity, from the dogmas imposed on the credulity of mankind by an ambitious priesthood. Many years were yet to elapse, before any attempts were to be made to trace, with analytical accuracy, the moral phenomena of human nature to their first principles in the constitution and condition of man; or even to disentangle the plain and practical lessons of Ethics, from the speculative and controverted articles of theological systems.” Assuming the fairness of the citation from Melanchthon, the sentiment expressed in it seems to me to involve an unaccountable oversight,—and, in some degree at least, a falling-in with the grand error of philosophical writers on Ethics. In allowing *equal authority* to the deductions of “learned men” from “the common sense and common feelings of human nature,” with that ascribed to the ten commandments, the moral law as given by Moses, the good reformer had surely forgotten the depravity of that nature the dictates of whose “common sense and common feelings” are thus identified in certainty and obligation with the direct announcements of the will of Deity; and had forgotten also the bias produced by this depravity in the minds of those very “learned men” by whom the deductions are drawn, and the theories framed. Granting, to no small extent, the correctness and authority of the dictates of conscience; still, as the conscience of a fallen creature, it is liable to be warped and deflected from rectitude in its decisions, and must not, therefore, have absolutely implicit reliance. So far from its being the design of Jehovah to “supersede by a law graven on stones that which is graven with his own finger on the table of the heart;” it is obvious that, had the law continued “written on the heart,” in the same sense, and to the same extent, as at first, there would never have been any occasion for the proclamation of it from Sinai, and the graving of it, for permanent appeal, on the tables of stone.....When Mr. Stewart speaks of the language of Melanchthon as “an important step towards a just

system of moral philosophy," and of "tracing with analytical accuracy the moral phenomena of human nature to their first principles in the constitution and condition of man," he proceeds on the common assumption, that the "constitution and condition of man,"—that is, of man as he now is,—afford a just criterion, and the only one accessible to us, of right and wrong; and that the "first principles of the moral phenomena of human life" are there to be sought, with the view of thence ascertaining a correct system of morals.

'To a certain extent, I have admitted, there is truth in the representations thus made by philosophers. Reason and conscience are not obliterated, but do certainly continue to bear testimony for God. What we plead for is, that in a depraved nature, subject to all the manifold biases of corruption, they cannot be trusted to as affording any *certain standard* either of truth or duty,—any infallible indication of the mind and will of Deity. The creature that has lost the moral image of God, cannot, in his moral constitution, present a fair exhibition either of what God is, or of what God wills, or afford any correct index to the principles of moral rectitude. Were the philosophers who write thus making any reference to the present state of our nature as being different from what it was originally, we should then understand their meaning with the qualifications which the recognition of such difference implies. But their appeals to the constitution of our nature for the principles of morals, are not only unaccompanied with any such admission, but contain either the implication, or the express avowal, of the contrary.' pp. 49—52.

In fact, as the Author justly remarks, 'there can be no boundary drawn for the philosophical moralist, that does not inclose a portion, far from inconsiderable, of the territory of the theologian.' Taking morals in its most enlarged and proper sense, as comprehending 'all the obligations, not of human beings alone, but of intelligent creatures universally, in all the relations they can occupy, whether to their Maker or to each other, together with the great principles from which these obligations arise',—theology is a branch of morals; and ethics, as we have already remarked, another. But since the primary duty man owes to his Maker, and the relations in which he stands to the Author of all created existence, must have, of necessity, an important bearing on all the social relations, and the duties connected with them, these two branches of morals cannot be treated independently of each other without leading to error. The same principles, the same modes of investigation, must be common to both. In theology, as in ethics, different modes of inquiry may be adopted; but, as the false philosophy includes its own theology, so does Christianity include its own ethics; and it involves nothing short of a denial of Revelation, or a tacit rejection of it, to maintain that, without Revelation, it is possible to ascertain either what is, morally, or what ought to be.

These remarks will, we hope, place in a strong light, the value of Dr. Wardlaw's labours, as well as the propriety of the present

title of the volume. It is one main part of his design, to shew that all systems of ethics that are not fundamentally Christian, must be essentially erroneous. Having, in the introductory lecture, illustrated the respective provinces of philosophy and theology, his object, in the next two, is to expose the mistakes we have adverted to in the usual method of conducting ethical inquiries, and especially the attempt to deduce a scheme of virtue from the present character of human nature. In the fourth lecture, he proceeds to examine the moral system of Bishop Butler, which may be designated, Dr. W. remarks, as 'the system of Zeno baptized into Christ.' Dr. Chalmers, with that rashness which so much detracts from the value of his authority, pronounces Bishop Butler's Sermons to contain 'the most precious repository of sound ethical principles extant in any language.' Yet even Sir James Mackintosh has pointed out the defectiveness of the learned Prelate's scheme; and defect, in a scheme of morals, is much the same as error, and must proceed from error. Bishop Butler contends, that our nature or constitution is adapted to virtue, 'as a watch is adapted to measure time', although it is liable to go wrong; and that therefore, to *follow nature*, is to live according to conscience, conscience being, in the complex constitution of the human mind, the legitimate ruling principle. Man's obligation to obey the rule of right within is, 'its being the law of his nature.' After citing these and similar expressions, Dr. W. proceeds:

'Now I entertain no doubt, that this is a just account of the original constitution of our nature,—that such is the due subordination of its various powers and propensions,—such the legitimate order of their respective operations. But you can hardly fail to have been sensible, how little reference there is, in these representations, to the fallen condition and depraved character of this nature. I am far from intending to insinuate, that the fallen and degenerate condition of man has no place in Butler's Theology. When treating, in his "Analogy," of the economy of redemption by a Mediator, he speaks of "the world's being in a state of ruin" as "a supposition which seems the very ground of the Christian Dispensation," and argues, on this ground, the reasonableness, from the analogy of divine providence, of the scheme of mediatorial interposition. But he is one of those to whom I have already alluded, as, in their reasonings on morals, appearing at times as if they had forgotten the characters of human nature which, on other occasions, they have admitted: and I must be excused for adding, that not only in this seeming forgetfulness, but also in the vague generality of the terms in which human degeneracy is usually expressed, and in the statements given by him of the influence of the Redeemer's atonement, and of the conditions, on man's part, of acceptance with God, there is evidence, that his impressions of the real amount of this degeneracy, as existing in the moral state and character of each individual man, were hardly adequate to the



unqualified and humbling representations of the inspired volume. In the extracts which have just been given from the Bishop's Sermons, we are certainly, in a great degree, allowed to lose sight of the present character of human nature, and are left to suppose it, in its present state, such as it was designed, by the author of its constitution, to be. The various parts of the watch are put together by the skill of the artist, each in its proper place, and all relatively adjusted to the production of a certain effect,—the correct measurement of time. So is it, according to Bishop Butler's theory, with human nature. It is "*adapted to virtue*" as evidently as "*a watch is adapted to measure time*." But, suppose the watch, by the perverse interference of some lover of mischief, to have been so thoroughly disorganized,—its moving and its subordinate parts and powers so changed in their collocation and their mutual action, that the result has become a constant tendency to go backward instead of forward, or to go backwards and forwards with irregular, fitful, ever-shifting alternation,—so as to require a complete remodelling, and especially a re-adjustment of its great moving power, to render it fit for its original purpose;—would not this be a more appropriate analogy for representing the present character of fallen man? The whole machine is out of order. The main-spring has been broken; and an antagonist power works all the parts of the mechanism. It is far from being with human nature, as Butler, by the similitude of the watch, might lead his reader to suppose. The watch, when duly adjusted, is only, in his phrase, "liable to be out of order." This might suit for an illustration of the state of human nature *at first*, when it received its constitution from its Maker. But it has lost its appropriateness *now*. That nature, alas! is not now a machine that is merely "apt to go out of order;" it is out of order; so radically disorganized, that the grand original power which impelled all its movements, has been broken and lost, and an unnatural power, the very opposite of it, has taken its place; so that it cannot be restored to the original harmony of its working, except by the interposition of the Omnipotence that framed it.' pp. 125, 7.

\* \* \* \* \*

'If human nature be in a state of depravity, conscience must partake of that depravity. If it did not, indeed, there could be no depravity. If the ruling power were right, all would be right that is subordinate. But where, I ask, in human nature now, is conscience, in the highest department of its exercise?—where is "*conscience towards God*?" What are the results of its authority?—What the actual state of things under its dictatorship? Let the speedy and universal loss of the original knowledge of the true God, answer the question. Let the polytheistic superstitions of heathenism, with all their fooleries, impurities, and ruthless cruelties,—let the sceptical theism, and the presumptuous atheism, of philosophy,—let the manifest and conscious ungodliness of the whole race of mankind,—answer the question. According to Butler, "wanton disregard and irreverence towards an infinite Being, our Creator, are by no means as suitable to the nature of man, as reverence and dutiful submission of heart towards that Almighty Being." But an abstract proposition as

to essential fitness and propriety is a different thing from a statement of fact. We ask, what is the *matter of fact*, as to the operation of conscience in this particular? Has this presiding and ruling power in the "nature of man" been found fulfilling its appropriate function, inspiring right feelings, and dictating right practice, towards the one blessed object of reverence, and love, and homage, and obedience? Does not the entire history of our race, from the beginning hitherto, reply in the negative?—And if conscience has failed here, we must insist upon it that it has essentially failed in every thing. It has proved treacherous in regard to the very first principle of all obligation; and it carries the spirit of this treason against God into the entire administration of its perverted power.—Even in its dictates towards fellow-creatures too, how sadly is it under the domination of the appetites, and passions, and selfish desires!—how constantly liable to be swayed and bribed to wrong decisions; and how much in danger are even its right judgments of being set aside by the power of such interfering influences! It may be, and incessantly is, tampered with in a thousand ways. The question, therefore, on our present subject, comes to be—how we can be sure of an unbiassed verdict;—and how, from a nature of which the principles are so disordered, and the aberrations, especially in the highest and most essential of all departments, so prodigious, we can, with any assurance of correctness, extract the pure and primary elements of moral goodness. It is not at all, whether conscience ought or ought not to be the ruling power, and the appetites and desires, the affections and passions, in subordination to its authoritative jurisdiction. This was the original state of things; and, so long as this state continued, man, in "following nature," followed a sure guide,—a guide whose counsels, intuitively discerned, were all divine. But when, in a discussion like the present, we proceed on such a view of human nature, our argument becomes purely hypothetical. Human nature, in this view of it, has now no existence. If it had;—if it retained its original character;—if all were in the harmony of holy principle, and under the direction of an inwardly-presiding and never-resisted Deity;—we should require no discussions to determine either the principle or the rule of moral obligation. But the question is, whether in human nature, as it now is, we have sufficient data, to warrant our assuming it as a standard from which to ascertain the principles of rectitude. Here, in my apprehension, lies the principal fallacy of Butler's system. Virtue, according to him, consists in "following nature:" but then the nature to be followed is not the nature of man as it now is: or, if it be, then, as formerly hinted, the conception entertained by the theorist of the depravity of man as a fallen creature, must have been far short of the scriptural representation of it.' pp. 128—31.

Dr. Wardlaw does not of course deny that Conscience continues, in fallen human nature, to 'witness in favour of God and 'his law'. But, 'in the highest department of all, its operation,' he remarks, 'is partial, erroneous, feeble, capricious, ineffectual.' 'The moral character of man', it is added, 'consists, properly 'and directly in his *dispositions*, not in the decisions of his judge-

'ment.' This may be admitted; but surely the respected Author uses language of very equivocal propriety, when he infers, that 'there can be nothing properly moral, therefore, in conscience; else there must be morality in hell.' There *will be* morality there; for there will be moral knowledge, and moral consciousness, and moral suffering. But Dr. W. must mean to employ the term morality as equivalent to goodness or virtue,—a very unusual, and (we submit) inaccurate use of the word. Nor can we approve of his definition of Conscience, as the mere 'exercise of the judgement in the department of morals.' The objection urged by Dr. Payne against this definition is, we must think, unanswerable: 'My judgement pronounces the conduct of a friend to be wrong, but it cannot be said, that my conscience condemns him.' Even Bishop Butler's definition goes much beyond our Author's statement, though cited in support of his own phraseology. The Bishop's words are: 'The principle in man by which he approves or disapproves his heart, temper, and actions, is conscience.' Now self-approbation or self-condemnation is assuredly something more than a mere exercise of judgement, deciding on the right or wrong of our conduct: it includes a sense of merit or demerit, founded on a conscious responsibility for our conduct. Dr. Wardlaw asks, What is conscience in a sinless creature? We reply, the same faculty that it is in a fallen creature—a *consciousness of moral accountableness*. So far from agreeing with Dr. W., that 'the operation of what is usually denominated conscience, strictly and properly began' when Adam fell, we should rather say, that its operation was disturbed by his sin, and that his conscience was most perfect before his sense of accountableness to God had been obscured or overcome by temptation. What do we understand by a seared or hardened conscience, but a state of mind in which, although the perception of right and wrong is not destroyed, the sense of moral accountableness appears to have become obliterated or suspended? Remorse differs from conscience, in being a consciousness not merely of responsibility, but of guilt. A tender conscience, that is, a deep and vivid sense of accountableness to God, may consist with a very erroneous, because ill informed judgement as to right and wrong. Surely, then, conscience cannot be identical with judgement; cannot consist in it. In other words, conscience is not the mind judging of the right or wrong of our own actions, but is the mind knowing and considering that, for choosing or doing the right or the wrong, we are accountable to the Author of our being. In a holy being, this sense of accountableness, connected with conscious rectitude and the enjoyment of the Divine favour, must be an element of perfect happiness. In a sinful being, it is that which makes conscious guilt a source of torment. We recollect the late Robert Hall making this profound remark



in a sermon upon these words, "There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked"—'No one in this world has reached the full susceptibility of conscience'.

We have anticipated in some degree the subject of Lecture V., 'On the Rule of Moral Obligation', containing some of the remarks on Conscience upon which we have felt it our duty to animadvert. In a note, Dr. Wardlaw adverts to the theories of Dr. Brown and Sir James Mackintosh upon the same subject, which we agree with him in deeming altogether inaccurate and erroneous. In discussing the *rule* of moral obligation, the Author draws an important distinction between the *principle* or foundation, and the *rule* or law of moral rectitude. The latter he identifies with the will of God. 'The two propositions, that man is a subject of 'the Divine Governor, and, that the will of the Divine Governor 'is his law', he regards 'as of identically the same import'. In Lecture VI. he proceeds to consider 'the original principle of 'Moral Obligation'. The will of God, Dr. W. shews, is not the origin of the principles of rectitude, but is itself determined by them. We must give in his own language his illustration of this cardinal proposition.

'When, in tracing back existence from the simple postulate that *something now is*, we arrive at the great First Cause, the Originator of all being but its own; and with a certainty strictly demonstrative, come to the conclusion that this great First Cause is a Being that exists by an absolute necessity of nature;—we are at once sensible that we can go no further. We have reached the ultimate point, beyond which there is nothing, and *can be* nothing.—It is true, that when we speak of Deity as existing by an absolute necessity, we use language which involves in it a great deal more than we are capable of distinctly comprehending:—but it is not by our capacity of comprehension that we are to measure truth; it is by the results of legitimate ratiocination. The conclusions to which we are conducted, may, in their vastness and abstruseness, be full of mystery,—they may have in them "a length and breadth, and depth and height, passing knowledge,"—while yet they are so sure, that every attempt even to imagine the contrary involves us in palpable contradiction.

'Thus it is with regard to the Divine *existence*. Now the very same process of reasoning which we apply to the existence, is, with equal legitimacy, applicable to his *nature*. If he exists by an absolute necessity, then by the same necessity he not only *is*, but *is what he is*.—And, whether his nature be considered physically, intellectually, or morally, the observation is equally true. Whatever attributes belong to it, they belong to it by the same necessity that is predicated of its existence. If, therefore, in tracing back existence, we arrive at our ultimate point in Deity,—being arrested and fixed in the eternal necessity of his being; must not the same be the result, in tracing to their origin the principles of moral rectitude?—Here also, do not we

reach our ultimate point in Deity? If we cannot go further back in regard to *being*, can we in regard to *principle*? Are we not arrested and fixed by the eternal necessity of the principles of the divine character,—the attributes or qualities of the divine nature,—just as really, and as finally, as we are by the necessity of the divine existence? It must be in the moral world as it is in the physical; with regard to virtue, as with regard to matter and mind. In tracing back existence, we come to the necessity of God's *being*; in tracing back principles, we come to the necessity of God's *character*. In neither case can we reach any further than this point of necessity. We are constrained to stop here:—and, when we have thus resolved the ultimate principles of moral rectitude in the creature, into conformity with the eternal and immutable prototype of all excellence in the nature of the Godhead, our minds repose, in delightful satisfaction, on this secure resting-place. To talk of any fitnesses of things by which, as a standard, *the rectitude of that nature itself* is to be tried and ascertained, is as inconsiderate as it is profane:—for, not only is this to suppose fitnesses existing independently of all being whatever, which is sheer absurdity; it is, at the same time, going beyond necessity, and assuming something ulterior, *according to which that which is necessary must be*: which is a plain contradiction in terms.' pp. 209—211.

We may be allowed to express our satisfaction at finding Dr. Wardlaw's sentiments upon this subject in complete harmony with those which have been maintained in this journal. Shall we be excused, if we transcribe a few sentences from a review of Professor Dewar's *Moral Philosophy*, which appeared nine years ago?

'That the will of God is the origin of the distinctions of right and wrong *to us*, that it is in fact *our* ultimate rule, might perhaps be admitted with safety, provided that it be borne in mind, that it cannot be the rule of the Divine conduct. The perfections of God, as Hooker finely remarks, are "a kind of law to his working; for that perfection which God is, giveth perfection to that he doth." "God, therefore, is a law both to Himself and to all other things besides". The immutability of the Divine will is the necessary consequence of the Divine perfections from which it emanates: and it follows, that the moral distinctions which are ultimately to be traced to those perfections, must also be immutable. . . . The will of God is *our* rule, or the criterion of virtue to us, because it is the expression of the Divine character, and the medium of discovering his infinite perfections. But, as the goodness of God towards his creatures is not the only attribute of the Divine nature, it follows, that his holy will cannot be *solely* determined by his goodness, nor can the happiness of mankind be its criterion. Moreover, the Divine will is the expression *to us* of other Divine attributes, besides that perfection of goodness of which the happiness of man is the object; and therefore, when we say that his will is the *immediate* criterion of

virtue, we must admit the ultimate criterion, that which determines the will of God, to be, not simple goodness, nor yet any end terminating in the creature,—but that ineffable perfection which includes infinite goodness in its nature, and which finds its highest end in its own exercise. “The general end of God’s eternal working”, says Hooker, “is the exercise of his most glorious and most abundant virtue.”

‘The eternal foundations of right and wrong, then, are laid in the Divine character. And, indeed, obedience to his declared will would cease to be virtue, could it be separated from those affections of heart, of which, not the will, but the character of God is the object. In other words, the essence and soul of virtue is the love of God; and all systems of morals which overlook this truth, in dissevering ethics from theology, must at once be unphilosophical and pernicious. Now, God is necessarily the perfection which he is; and virtue being the love of whatever God is,—of that necessary perfection which is the glory of God,—the nature of virtue itself must be necessary and immutable.’ \*

The latter part of Dr. Wardlaw’s sixth lecture is occupied with an examination of President Dwight’s modified theory of Utility as the foundation of Virtue, and of Paley’s still more exceptionable scheme of Morals as based on Expediency. Paley’s erroneous theory, apparently borrowed from Archbishop King, may be traced in part to his having been led, by the imperfect analogy between human legislation and the Divine Government, to view them as strictly parallel. The will of the legislator is the criterion of political duty; and the good of society is the criterion of all wise and upright legislation. But, although the will of God is the criterion of religious obedience, and the true foundation of moral duty, yet, neither in the motives and obligation to obedience, nor in the criterion of wisdom and rectitude, does the analogy hold good between political and moral duty, consistently with either sound philosophy or religious reverence. President Dwight combats the error of Paley, and maintains that Utility, as judged by ourselves, cannot be a proper rule of moral conduct; but he admits, that, were we omniscient, and able to discern the true nature of *all* the effects of our conduct, it might be so. ‘To the ‘eye of God’, he affirms, ‘it is the real rule’. Dr. Wardlaw shews that this assertion is both exceptionable in itself, and at variance with other statements of the learned American divine, which recognize a foundation of virtue ‘in the nature of things’. Now the *nature* of things, whatever the phrase may imply, and the *tendency* of things, or their utility, are not the same thing; and yet, they are obviously confounded.

---

\* Eclectic Rev., 2d Series, Vol. XXV. pp. 516, 517.



‘To say, that virtue is founded in utility, and, at the same time, that virtue possesses a previous and essential nature, from which it is that this utility arises, is manifestly incorrect. It is confounding the effect with the cause,—essential properties with their appropriate results.’ p. 231.

‘If, instead of representing utility as the *foundation* of the principles of moral rectitude, or as that on account of which they are to be regarded as right, the utilitarian theorists had represented it as a *manifestation of the nature and tendency of those principles*, they would have come nearer the truth. It must be obvious to every mind, that a principle may, in its nature, when put into partial exercise, be fitted to produce happiness, whilst yet the production of happiness is not that which constitutes the rectitude of the principle. While I more than hesitate to admit, that utility, or the tendency to happiness, is the ultimate principle into which moral rectitude is to be resolved, there can be no hesitation in admitting, that happiness is the direct and invariable result of the putting forth of the principles of moral rectitude on the part of the Godhead ;—and, as a consequence, that, when *understood in its proper extent*, and, *estimated by a mind of capacity sufficient to comprehend that extent*, utility, though not itself constituting rectitude, becomes its legitimate and correct criterion.’

pp. 218, 219.

But ‘the proper extent,’ Dr. W. proceeds to explain as comprising what is ‘inseparably associated with the good of the universe, and essential to its attainment, but still above it, first in order, first in magnitude,’—*the glory of God*. And the criterion of rectitude is, consequently, one, he remarks, which ‘only the Divine mind is possessed of sufficient extension and intuitive certainty of discernment’ to apply. Thus guarded and explained, our Author’s admission amounts to much the same as a denial of the position, that utility can be even a *criterion* of rectitude. The utilitarian will not thank him for a concession of which he can make no advantage. Dr. Wardlaw occupies safer ground, when he takes his stand upon the position, that utility is not the foundation, but the *result* of virtue or moral rectitude. God is holy, not *because* he wills the happiness of his creatures, but he wills their happiness, because he is holy ; and the Divine will is a proper rule of virtue to us, not *because* he wills the good of his universe, but because his will is the expression of that Perfection which God is, and the love of which is the highest virtue of the creature.

The subject of the ensuing lecture, one of the most valuable of the series, is, ‘the identity of morality and religion.’ The Author here exhibits Christian Ethics in their true character ; demonstrating, that love to God, which is ‘obedience in the heart,’ as obedience is love in the life, is ‘the virtue of the Bible,’ and the only true morality. In the next lecture, the question is examined, ‘how far Disinterestedness is an essential

'quality in legitimate love to God;' and President Edwards's 'transcendentalism' upon this point is respectfully dissented from, as having in it 'more of the metaphysics of the schools, than of the simplicity of the Bible. We must make room for the following beautiful passage.

'How, then, stands the case? What is the view of his character in which God actually becomes the object of love to the converted sinner? To this question I would answer in one word,—it is the view of it in which it is revealed in the cross. There the spiritually enlightened sinner sees "Mercy and Truth meeting together, Righteousness and Peace embracing each other,"—holiness in union with love, justice with grace;—and, under the agency of the regenerating Spirit, he loves God in the unbroken harmony of all his attributes, as displayed in the Redeemer's work,—the harmony of "light" and "love." The light without the love,—the purity of the Divine Nature flashing upon the mind apart from its benevolence, could only drive to despair:—the love without the light, the mere benevolence of God disunited from his essential purity, could engender no feeling but that of a selfish satisfaction in sin. But, light and love together constituting the true character of God as it is manifested in the cross, it is in this view of it that it becomes the object of love to the believing sinner. The very consideration, that the love which springs up in his bosom is love to God *as He is seen in Jesus Christ*, is of itself sufficient to shew, that it must be love to holiness as well as to goodness;—for the love displayed in Christ is *holy love*,—love so blended and incorporated with purity, that in the mind which takes a right view of the Saviour's work, the one cannot be disunited from the other. On the cross, the two inscriptions stand alike conspicuous—"God is light," and "God is love." Both are *seen* together; both are *believed* together; and the love which springs from this faith regards the Divine Being under both aspects,—comprehending at once gratitude to the God of mercy, and delight in the God of holiness. It is thus the same principle with that which rules in the bosoms of creatures that have never fallen. There is in the nature of the Divine Being what is fitted to inspire the very holiest and happiest of creatures with awe, even while they love, delight, and adore. The entire character, in all its parts, is at once the object of "reverence and godly fear," and of the purest, the most fervent, and the most confiding affection; and by the contemplation of it in the cross, both feelings are called forth into exercise, even in angelic bosoms. Were it in our power to separate these views of God;—could we give a guilty creature, in the full consciousness of his guilt, to see one side only of the manifestation,—to see the cross as the exhibition solely of the untainted purity, the undissembling truth, the unbending justice, and the avenging jealousy, of the Being with whom he has to do, the cross itself would become the mightiest instrument of torture to the awakened soul,—subjecting it to the agonies of a spiritual crucifixion,—inflicting on it the horrors of despair. But the cross, whilst it shows the holiness of God in all its purity, the justice of God in all its strictness, and the jealousy of God in all its consuming terrors, holds forth also to view the love of

God in all its infinitude, the compassions of God in all their tenderness, the mercy of God in all its fulness and freeness:—so that, from the believing view of it there spring up, at the same moment, the emotions of affectionate fear and reverential love,—of complacent delight and thankful joy,—under the combined influence of which the happy spirit relies upon him, serves him, imitates him, enjoys him:—and in ninety-nine cases out of the hundred,—probably in nine hundred and ninety-nine out of the thousand, were the metaphysical question proposed to the simple-hearted subject of divine grace, while charmed and melted and gladdened by the new lights that have come in upon his mind, whether the love of gratitude or the love of complacency had first touched his soul,—he would be at a loss for a reply;—he would be in danger of fretting at the unwelcome interruption thrown into the delightful current of his feelings; and especially if you joined with the inquiry, the puzzle about the order of nature and the order of time:—he could only tell you, that he had seen the love of God in Christ, and that it had won and captivated his heart;—that in Christ he saw God as at once the God of grace and the God of holiness; and that he loved him for both,—for the grace of his holiness, and for the holiness of his grace,—for what He was in himself, and for what He had done for sinners!’ pp. 320—323.

The concluding lecture, ‘On the Peculiarities of Christian ‘Obligation and Duty,’ commences with some able strictures on President Edwards’s theory of Virtue, which is shewn to be open to very serious and fatal objections; and in a note, Dr. Wardlaw does us the honour to refer to an article in our former Series, in which we had shewn how singularly that profound thinker had failed in the outset of his attempt to construct a moral theory\*. The Lecturer then proceeds to illustrate the influence of the Gospel in producing love to God,—shewing the nature and operation of Faith, by which the mind is brought under the habitual control of the motives to trust and to obedience which the Gospel originates. In conclusion, he briefly points out the peculiar bearings of the discoveries of Revelation upon the social duties and affections; apologizing for not entering into the minuter details of Christian morals or questions of casuistry. The design of the Series was, to illustrate and establish *general principles*,—a field of quite sufficient extent; and it was errors in these, that the Author was most anxious to point out. We have already referred incidentally to the Notes and Illustrations, which form a very valuable Appendix to the Lectures.

In conclusion, we cannot refrain from congratulating the founders of the Congregational Lecture upon this highly gratifying

---

\* See Ecl. Rev. 2d Series. Vol. XIX. pp. 99 et seq. In that article, the reader will also find an examination of Bp. Butler’s not less defective theory of Virtue. See also E. R. 3d Series. Vol. VI. p. 289. (Oct. 1831.)



commencement of their Series ; and to the much respected Author we tender our warmest thanks for a volume which is adapted to reflect honour upon the denomination of which he is an ornament, and to do good service to the cause of Christian Philosophy.

---

Art. III. *Poems, chiefly Religious*. By the Rev. H. F. Lyte, A.M. 12mo. pp. 165. London, 1833.

WE have had occasion to pronounce a more favourable opinion of Mr. Lyte's poetical talents, as displayed in his former productions \*, than would be borne out by this volume of miscellaneous poems ; and we will not retract it. The Author of the following stanzas, which breathe the soul of poetry, shall enjoy immunity from our criticisms.

‘ ON A NAVAL OFFICER BURIED IN THE ATLANTIC.

‘ There is, in the wide, lone sea,  
A spot unmarked, but holy ;  
For there the gallant and the free  
In his ocean bed lies lowly.

‘ Down, down, within the deep,  
That oft to triumph bore him,  
He sleeps a sound and pleasant sleep,  
With the salt waves washing o’er him.

‘ He sleeps serene, and safe  
From tempest or from billow,  
Where the storms, that high above him chafe,  
Scarce rock his peaceful pillow.

‘ The sea and him in death  
They did not dare to sever :  
It was his home while he had breath ;  
’Tis now his rest for ever.

‘ Sleep on, thou mighty dead !  
A glorious tomb they’ve found thee—  
The broad blue sky above thee spread,  
The boundless waters round thee.

‘ No vulgar foot treads here ;  
No hand profane shall move thee ;  
But gallant fleets shall proudly steer,  
And warriors shout, above thee.

---

\* Ecl. Rev. Vol. XVI. p. 143. Art. *Henry Schultze*, a Tale, with other Poems, 1821. Ib. Vol. XXVI. p. 269. Art. *Lyte's Tales in Verse*, 1826.

‘ And when the last trump shall sound,  
And tombs are asunder riven,  
Like the morning sun from the wave thou’lt bound,  
To rise and shine in heaven.’

The most beautiful poem in the volume is one which we hope we may consider as an effort of imagination, and, as such, a happy one, for it has the pathos of reality. It is entitled, ‘Sad Thoughts,’—sad indeed, were they real. The thoughts that burn and flash in the following stanzas are such as might almost heal the wound of disappointed love: they seem the genuine inspiration of the mountain breeze and the Alpine landscape.

‘ THE ALPS.

- ‘ The Alps—the Alps—the joyous Alps,  
Are all around me heaving high ;  
I bow me to their snowy scalps,  
That rush into the sky.
- ‘ Hail, lordly land of storm and strife,  
To poetry and wonder dear !  
’Tis worth an age of common life,  
To feel as I do here.
- ‘ To look down on that deep-blue lake ;  
To look up in that glorious sky ;  
To feel my soul within me wake,  
And ask for wings to fly :
- ‘ To bound the airy heights along ;  
Above the floating clouds to stand ;  
And meet Creation’s God, among  
The wonders of His hand.
- ‘ Hail, scenes of holy grandeur ! hail !  
Where mortal sense stands hushed and awed.  
O, who could gaze on such, and fail  
To think of Thee, my God ?
- ‘ Alone and dread Thou dwellest here,  
The source and soul of all I see.  
I look around in joy and fear,  
And feel I am with Thee !
- ‘ I see Thee on the mountain sit,  
At summer’s noon, sublime and still ;  
Or in the giant shadows flit  
Along from hill to hill.
- ‘ I read thy presence and thy power  
In each eternal rock I meet ;  
I trace thy love in every flower  
That blossoms at my feet.

'Thou speakest from each rolling cloud  
That pours its stormy mirth on high,  
When cliff to cliff is shouting loud,  
Responsive to the sky.

'Thy voice at night is in the sound  
Of sinking glaciers, rushing rills,  
And avalanches thundering round  
Among the startled hills.

'The mountain mists, in all their moods,  
The snows by earthly feet untrod,  
The fells, the forests, and the floods,  
Are all instinct with God.

'O regions wonderful and wild,  
Sublimity's inspiring home,  
Scenes I have dreamt of since a child,  
And longed as now to roam!

'And I am here! and I may range  
Your length and breadth without control,  
And feel a world all new and strange  
Break in upon my soul!

'Hail, mountain monarchs! hail! Again  
Before your reverend feet I bow:  
How poor is language to explain  
The thoughts that fill me now!

'*Il ne faut pas dédaigner,*' remarks Mde. de Stael, '*dans quelque tristesse qu'on soit plongé, les dons primitifs du Créateur; la vie et la nature. . . L'existence est en elle-même une chose merveilleuse. L'on voit souvent les malades n'invoquer qu'elle. Les sauvages sont heureux seulement de vivre. Les consolations philosophiques ont moins d'empire que les jouissances causées par la spectacle de la terre et du ciel.*' The above stanzas form a beautiful commentary upon these striking sentiments. It is true, that physical consolations, if we may use the expression, are of more virtue than philosophical ones: they are the next best to what are infinitely better, spiritual ones. But when these are superinduced upon the primary gifts of the 'Creator, life and 'nature,' then it is that existence is felt to be indeed 'a marvellous 'thing,' and that the works of God inspire the full emotion they are adapted to produce. How joyous is the sentiment with which the Royal Psalmist dwells upon the spectacle of creation! "O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast Thou made them all: the earth is full of thy riches!" Till, at length, he seems to concentrate his feelings in the vow of gratitude: "I will sing praise to my God while I have my being; my meditation of Him shall be sweet; I will be glad in the Lord." (Psal. civ.)



Mr. Lyte has announced a volume under the title of "The Spirit of the Psalms." If it shall answer to the *import* of the title, it will be indeed a delightful volume, for how little of the spirit of the Psalms is there in either our psalmody or our poetry! But we should not be much surprised at finding that the Author has caught and given utterance to more of that spirit in some of the poems in this volume, than in the entire result of his attempt at 'condensing' it in his versification of the Psalter.

The more strictly devotional poems in this volume are evidently the unelaborated effusions of piety; but the religious Poet will do well to bear in mind a sentiment of the admirable Philip Henry, who assigned as a reason for bestowing laborious preparation upon sermons designed for the plainest and most unlettered audience, that he would not present to God what had cost him nothing. Some of these poems, though excellent in the quality of the sentiment, have evidently cost little. This would seem to be the case where, in stanzas requiring alternate rhymes, the rhyme is disregarded in the first and third lines. Not only is the ear disappointed, but the mind resents the want of skill or of pains which it indicates. We must also express our conscientious objection against the employment of our Lord's human name, without any adjunct, in either invoking or speaking of him whom his own disciples called "The Lord." No precedents can reconcile to our feelings or judgement such forms of expression as

'Till I find them for ever in Jesus's breast.'

And,

'My soul shall dwell where Jesus is.'

St. Paul's language is: "To depart and be with *Christ*,"—"So shall we ever be with *the Lord*,"—"In the presence of our *Lord Jesus Christ*."

But these are slight flaws, such as only critical eyes, perhaps, would detect or be offended by, in a volume which will delight every reader of taste and piety, and improve all to whom it yields delight. Waiving any further criticism, from which, indeed, we had intended altogether to abstain, we shall close our brief notice with another specimen, which we think will sustain our cordial commendation of the volume.

#### 'EVENING.

'Sweet evening hour! sweet evening hour!  
That calms the air, and shuts the flower;  
That brings the wild bee to its nest,  
The infant to its mother's breast.

'Sweet hour! that bids the labourer cease;  
That gives the weary team release,  
And leads them home, and crowns them there  
With rest and shelter, food and care.

- ' O season of soft sounds and hues,  
Of twilight walks among the dews,  
Of feelings calm, and converse sweet,  
And thoughts too shadowy to repeat !
- ' The weeping eye that loathes the day,  
Finds peace beneath thy soothing sway ;  
And faith and prayer, o'er-mastering grief,  
Burst forth, and bring the heart relief.
- ' Yes, lovely hour ! thou art the time  
When feelings flow, and wishes climb ;  
When timid souls begin to dare,  
And God receives and answers prayer.
- ' Then, trembling through the dewy skies,  
Look out the stars, like thoughtful eyes  
Of angels, calm reclining there,  
And gazing on this world of care.
- ' Then, as the earth recedes from sight,  
Heaven seems to ope her fields of light,  
And call the fettered soul above,  
From sin and grief, to peace and love.
- ' Sweet hour ! for heavenly musing made,  
When Isaac walked, and Daniel prayed ;  
When Abram's offering God did own,  
And Jesus loved to be alone.
- ' Who has not felt that Evening's hour  
Draws forth devotion's tenderest power ;  
That guardian spirits round us stand,  
And God himself seems most at hand ?
- ' The very birds cry shame on men,  
And chide their selfish silence, then :  
The flowers on high their incense send,  
And earth and heaven unite and blend.
- ' Let others hail the rising day ;  
I praise it when it fades away ;  
When life assumes a higher tone,  
And God and heaven are all my own.'

- Art. IV. 1. *An Address delivered on laying the first Stone of the New King's Weigh-house, a Place of Worship intended for the Use of a Congregational Church.* By T. Binney. 4to., 1s. 6d. London, 1833.
2. *The Case of the Dissenters*, in a Letter addressed to the Lord Chancellor. 8vo., pp. 64. Price 1s. 6d. London, 1833.
3. *Seven Letters on National Religion*, addressed to the Rev. Henry Melvill, A.M., late Fellow and Tutor of St. Peter's College, Cambridge. By Charles Smith, B.D., Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Cambridge. 8vo., pp. 304. Price 7s. 6d. London, 1833.
4. *The Principle of Voluntary Churches, not the Principle of an Establishment, proved to be the real Origin of Romish and Priestly Domination*, an Historical Essay. By James Gibson, A.M., Assistant to the Rev. Dr. Lockhart. 8vo., pp. 96. Price 1s. Glasgow, 1833. [Published under the Superintendence of the Glasgow Association for promoting the Interests of the Church of Scotland.]
5. *Considerations on Civil Establishments of Religion*; with an Appendix, containing Remarks on Dr. Inglis's Vindication. By H. Heugh, D.D. Third Edition. 12mo., pp. 98. Price 1s. Glasgow, 1833.
6. *On the Causes, Influence, and Prospects of the Secession*, in Connection with the Prospects of the Church of Scotland. By the Rev. William Mackray, A.M., Stirling. 8vo., pp. 47. Glasgow, 1833.
7. *The First Blast of the Trumpet* against the Monstrous Usurpation of Church-Patrons in Scotland. By John Knox, the Younger. 8vo., pp. 44. Price 1s. Edinburgh, 1833.

HOW fond soever men have in all ages appeared to be of fighting for abstract principles, points of faith, metaphysical distinctions,—the idols of intellect, the watchwords of party,—yet, it will always be found that the real cause and origin of such polemic or political disputes, lie deeper than the ostensible subject of contention;—that they relate to some actual grievance. Under an excited state of feeling, the mind disdains to be tied down to the palpable and the definite, and *idealises*, if we may so speak, the object of its passionate regard, which then becomes the nucleus of a thousand indefinite associations. Thus it is that people seem to be philosophically quarrelling about general propositions, or fighting for pure abstractions, Orthodoxy, Episcopacy, Independence, Country, Church and State, the Voluntary Principle,—when the truth is, that the real cause of the excitement is something which comes much more closely home to the business and bosoms. It has been justly remarked, that no people were ever found to give trouble to their Rulers, unless under the pressure of extortion or intolerance, or, in more familiar



phrase, unless pinched either in their pockets or in their consciences. There may be a few turbulent spirits, intriguing politicians, disappointed younger brothers, who shall succeed in doing, perhaps, a little temporary mischief; but the mass of the people are quiet, and are not easily lashed into commotion, except when they are starving, or when their money is taken from them without law or reason, or when their household interests, among which religion ranks as the chief and the safeguard of the rest, are sacrilegiously invaded by intolerance or oppression.

What was it that gave to the question of Parliamentary Reform its all-absorbing interest? Only a small portion of the nation might seem to have had any direct interest in the object; comparatively few had any distinct notion of what they clamoured for; and it might be easy to place in a ridiculous light the intense excitement which the subject occasioned, and the vague and unreasonable expectations it awakened. But, for half a century, the nation had been smothering feelings of growing dissatisfaction against the profligate system of government by patronage and corruption, which had continually added to the public burdens, and perpetuated the most flagrant abuses; and if Reform might seem but an empirical remedy, the evils which prompted the general desire of relief were substantial and great. Well was it for the country, that the full tide of popular feeling, which had long been threatening to burst its bounds, could be turned into this constitutional channel, and directed to the purification, instead of the subversion of our glorious institutions. But Parliamentary Reform was not an imaginary remedy. It let in *hope*, which is itself relief. It recognised the claims of the people to be protected by their representatives. And it has made it the interest both of the present and of future Administrations to consult the popular interests.

Had they been imaginary grievances which prompted the anxiety for the reform of Parliament; that splendid measure of enlightened legislation might have been deemed sufficient redress. But while that measure has given vent to political agitation, and re-adjusted, as it were, the safety-valve of the Constitution, it has not repaired the wrongs which the nation have been suffering at the hands of the Twin Giant Usurpers, Corruption and Monopoly. Corporation Reform, Law Reform, Church Reform *must* follow;—must, not because the people are strong, but because they are in the right; not because they have numerical force on their side, for that might be dealt with by intellectual superiority and political skill, but because they have reason, justice, and conscience too.

What is it that has excited the national determination in favour of Church Reform, or rather, the prevalent hostility against the Church Establishment? Assuredly no abstract principle or ima-

ginary grievance. It has not originated with the Dissenters; it has not sprung from Dissent. First, there has been the heavy grievance of the tithe system and all its vexatious accompaniments, pressing with augmented weight upon the diminished profits of industry; and upon the sore feeling thus occasioned has been superinduced the discovery, at which the people of England seem suddenly to have arrived by the simple use of their own eyes, that the Church Establishment is a very costly, ill-administered, and inefficient piece of machinery for its professed purpose, characterized by all the vices of the feudal system, and open to all the objections chargeable upon a corporation monopoly.

The Protestant Dissenters of England, we say, have had little or no share in bringing about that revolution in public feeling which threatens the very foundations of the Establishment. Their opinions were known, by all who cared to know them, to be in opposition alike to the exclusive claims and to the policy of ecclesiastical Establishments; but they excited little attention or regard. The movement in favour of church reform has not proceeded from any class of dissidents. It is quite evident, as remarked by the author of the very able exposition of "The Case of the Dissenters," that they have had no hand in originating it; for 'hitherto, with the exception of Scotland, they have been both 'silent and still.'

'They may have memorialized the Ministers on some particular evil; but they have declined to publish even such memorial to the world. At this moment, their whole case is neither before the Public nor the Government. Many may blame them for not having spoken earlier; none can blame them for speaking now. It is a crisis they have not made: it is a crisis they must not neglect.'

Had there even been no great body of Dissenters in the kingdom, the standing grievance of the Tithe must have brought on before long the crisis of the Establishment. 'A more *unfortunate* property,' to cite the language of the late Law Professor of King's College, 'could not have been conferred on the Church; not only as it is *a property increasing in value, in modern times, in an undue degree compared with other property*; but as communicating an amount of power, interference, and secular importance, highly hostile to the character of the clergy as teachers of religion, and offensive to those over whom it is exercised, in right not of private property, but of public function, of a nature purporting to be the most opposed to the worldly-mindedness of lucre and power.' In other words, it is an unfortunate property, because its arbitrary and variable nature stamps it with the character of extortion;—because its augmentation has been not only disproportionate, but unattended by any corresponding increase of benefit to the community;—and be-



cause the real labourer, the working curate, reaps no advantage from this barbarous and intolerable tax upon productive industry. The scandalous injustice of the curate system has been only rendered the more palpable and striking by the improved respectability of that order of clerical stipendiaries; and in many cases, the piety of the more respectable portion of the church-going population has been offended at once by the rapacity of the incumbent and the pauperism of his substitute and drudge. Pluralities, non-residence, and the tithe-law, especially as administered by the proctor, together compose, in harmonious conjunction, the most odious and iniquitous system that was ever legalised. To pretend that Religion either lends it her sanction, or derives advantage from it, is an insult to Christianity. The Fellow of St. Peter's honestly admits, that the priests of Juggernaut would have as good a right to the tithe, if invested with this national portion 'by an act of the King and the Great Council of the realm,' as the clergy have now. 'Even by a Christian,' he says, 'must the same tithes be paid, however he regret that a mode of payment ordained by God himself, should be deserted to the service of national idolatry.' So that, should Parliament re-invest the Roman Catholic Church of Ireland with the tithe, it will, according to this Writer, be the duty of Lord Roden and all others 'cheerfully' to pay the same. And their comfort will be, that, 'as an idol is nothing in the world, obedience to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, is indeed a most solemn thing.' So again, as to Church-rates, a mode of payment quite as much ordained by God as the tithe, Mr. Smith says:

'This payment, one among others in return for civil privileges and national protection, is made, whether the building be the Church of Christ or a temple of Juggernaut, and the principle of rebellion is equally involved in its evasion and resistance.' Only... '*if our Church be part of the Church of Christ, to rebellion in these matters is added apostacy.*' p. 103.

Government have clearly Mr. Smith's own consent to tax him for any thing. But neither his theology nor his law will go down with the British people of the nineteenth century. The question is not what private persons are warranted in withholding, but what Parliament would do right to decree in this matter. The nation may, it is admitted by this Writer, recall its lands and tithes; and in such case, it would be the duty of the clergy, according to his argument, to submit, 'in patience of hope' to the powers that be! Nay, who can doubt the meekness and apostolic charity of this churchman, after reading the following passage?

'If need be, let us *with this joy* (in our calling) betake ourselves at once to the tent-making of the Apostle;—if, haply, by thus appearing



in the garb familiar to heathen persecution, we may persuade these our weak brethren to discern better the blessedness of the Word and Sacraments as we apostolically administer them.' p. 102.

*Risum teneatis amici?* A Cambridge fellow betaking himself to tent-making is a good joke. But who would imagine, on reading such a passage as this, that millions of the people of England are cheerfully supporting by their voluntary contributions, their own ministers of the word and sacraments; and that those very ministers who thus appear in the apostolic garb, not of tent-makers, but of preachers of the Gospel living of the Gospel, are looked down upon with contempt because they are not of the tithe-endowed Church? We must, however, transcribe the paragraph which immediately follows the above rhetorical flourish.

'But tithes are *conditionally* assigned, and the nation duly superintends an interchange of labour, manual and spiritual, between those whose labour is of the body and of the mind: *if the interchange be not reciprocal*, if the spiritual sower sow not his spiritual things, and be not occupied therein to the full supply of the spiritual wants committed to his charge, then assuredly the apostolical direction is as applicable to his punishment as to the case of any other indolent member of the body politic: "This we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat." p. 101.

Excellent! said! And the manner in which the Apostolical direction is enforced in the Church of England, is one of the many proofs of her close resemblance to the primitive Church, and of her peculiar claim to the epithet apostolic. Dissenters who reap none of the spiritual things of the tithe-receivers, would seem, on the above stated principle of reciprocity, to be fairly entitled to claim exemption from supplying of their temporal things. But then, Mr. S. adds, 'the tithe-payer is not the superintendent of this reciprocal supply of spiritual and temporal wants,' but the nation. Granted; and the matter is about to be brought before the great inquest of the nation, where this golden principle of reciprocity, and of making the work and pay correspond, will, we trust, receive the more attention from being thus authoritatively promulgated from the walls of St. Peter's College.

The tithe-system, although long felt as a grievance, would nevertheless have maintained itself in this country, in all probability, for another fifty years, had not the Irish people, wearied out by oppression, assumed at length an attitude of resistance to the exactions of that Church which they regard as at once foreign and heretical. In Ireland, the distinction between a National Religion and a State Religion is broadly illustrated. There, the alliance of Church and State has hitherto been complete, and its fruits have ripened under the golden beams of Protestant ascendancy. The

Church Establishment has been maintained there, not for the benefit of the nation, for the national church is the Romish, but avowedly for political purposes. Lord Roden is reported to have used these remarkable words in the House of Lords, on presenting a petition against the Government plan of education, on the 20th of March last: 'The Protestants have been *the English garrison in Ireland*, since the time of Henry VIII.' The Irish Church Establishment is an integral part of this garrison system. The Protestant clergy are represented by an apologist for that church, the Rev. Mr. Newland, as being, from the reign of William III. up to the Union, confessedly too much engaged in political warfare and secular enterprise. 'They were,' he says, 'considered as invaders, living in pitched tents in an enemy's country.' Every barrier raised against Popery in Ireland, it has been remarked, has been at the same time a limit to the spread of Protestantism, which has garrisoned the country, but never conquered it. Up to the walls of the churches, 'those melancholy fortresses of the Establishment,' the country has remained in the hands of the enemy. Meanwhile, the wealth of the clergy has gone on augmenting with the decline of Protestantism; and as rents have risen, as tillage has extended, as the population has increased, the peasantry have become more and more depressed, and more and more alienated from the landlord's church, as that church has grown richer and richer, till it has acquired the inglorious pre-eminence of being 'the greatest ecclesiastical enormity of Europe.' The large extent of the parishes, which had been laid out on a scale suited to a thinly scattered population and to pasture farms, when those pastures were turned into corn-fields, promoted the beneficed clergy into the rank of landholders; raising them to a position in society above the class of small gentry, who lingered in the country, only because their incomes were not sufficient to enable them to quit it. Thus elevated above their proper sphere, the clergy became transformed into a class of magistrates and country gentlemen; and their neglected congregations, separated from them by a still widening interval, gradually fell away, and were incorporated with those of the Romish clergy. The faster, however, the people have fallen off from the Establishment, the more vigorously their rulers have gone on building churches, to adorn the landscape, where they appear as trophies, or rather mausolea of the Protestant faith. Like the Grecian temples, these picturesque edifices are designed to be looked at from without; few enter the sacred precincts, but the priest. 'There have been churches, and resident ministers too, in many parishes, time out of mind,' says Mr. O'Driscoll, 'where there are yet no Protestants;—churches built or building in numerous places, in which there is to be, perhaps sometimes a service, but never congregations, and where it has



‘happened that a military force has occasionally been necessary to protect the builders from the assaults of the flock. Meek flock! happy shepherds!’ And so long as funds were to be had out of the First Fruits, and a church-building-rate could be levied on the Catholic peasantry, this propagation of Protestantism by brick and mortar, this ornamental spire-building, went briskly forward. In 1826, there were applications to the Board for grants to build fifty-eight new churches, which were refused only for want of funds! Mr. Newland affirms, that, in the diocese of Armagh alone, there are nearly as many churches now, as there were in the whole island in 1792. And for whose benefit? At whose cost? The Irish Establishment does not embrace within its pale more than a sixteenth of the population. In Ulster, indeed, where, more than in any other part of Ireland, the ‘clear-ance of the Episcopalian clergy had’, we are told, ‘been effectual in the days of the Stuarts’, Protestantism has taken root. There, and there alone, it is the religion of the people. But there, the majority of Protestants are Dissenters from the Establishment, and worship in buildings without spires; and their ministers have no participation in that fatal boon, the tithe, which has been the curse and blight of Protestantism in Ireland. By too many advocates of the Church and State system, however, it would be deemed far better that the bulk of the Irish should remain Papists, than become Presbyterian or Independent Dissenters.

Such is the working of the Establishment in Ireland! Now ‘the authority of a church establishment’, Paley tells us, ‘is founded on its utility; and whenever’, he adds, ‘upon this principle, we deliberate concerning the form, propriety, or comparative excellency of different Establishments, the single view under which we ought to consider any of them is, that of a *scheme of instruction*; the single end we ought to propose by them, is the *preservation and communication of religious knowledge*. Every other idea, and every other end, that have been mixed with this, as the making of the church an engine, or even an ally of the State; converting it into the means of strengthening or diffusing influence, or regarding it as a support of regal, in opposition to popular forms of government; have served only to debase the institution, and to introduce into it numerous corruptions and abuses.’ If this be the only proper view of an Ecclesiastical Establishment, we are warranted in saying, that, in Ireland, the result of the Church Establishment has been an absolute failure. As a scheme of instruction, as an instrument of propagating religious knowledge, it has proved of no utility; not simply inefficient, but mischievous, by having perpetuated degrading and irritating civil distinctions, and by fortifying the Papist in his prejudices against the abhorred faith which



he has judged of by its fruits—the penal laws, the tithe, and the vestry cess. But if Paley's view of the subject be objected to, and the advocate of Ecclesiastical Establishments prefer the *garrison* hypothesis, which contemplates the Church as an engine of political influence; still, the utility of the Establishment is more than questionable. If it be contended that the Irish clergy, though of a different creed from their parishioners, have been serviceable as a resident gentry, it is obvious that this end would have been far better answered, had the Romish Church been left in possession of her original property. If, with David Hume, another advocate of Ecclesiastical Establishments, it be maintained, that 'the interested diligence of the clergy is what every wise legislator will study to prevent;' and 'that, in reality, the most decent and advantageous composition which the civil magistrate can make with the spiritual guides of the people, is to bribe their indolence by assigning stated salaries to their profession, and rendering it superfluous for them to be further active than merely to prevent their flock from straying in quest of new pastors;'—the experiment must be admitted to have but too fatally succeeded; but, in order to its proving beneficial, the composition ought to have been made with the Popish priests. If, with Adam Smith, it be argued, that 'where there is an established or governing religion, the sovereign can never be secure, unless he has the means of influencing, in a considerable degree, the greater part of the teachers of that religion'\*,—the insecurity of the State in Ireland is at once explained by the *political* mistake that has been made in confining the influence of the Crown to the teachers of that religion which, though the governing or Government religion, does not govern the people. If the religion of the majority is that which claims to be established and endowed, then the established religion of Ireland ought to be that of the Romish Church. Can we wonder that the mere secular politician should come to this conclusion? The Earl of Mansfield, in opposing the Irish Church Reform Bill, is reported to have avowed, that 'he would infinitely prefer seeing the Roman Catholic religion established in Ireland, as the Presbyterian was in Scotland, to the passing of that Bill'. That is, he would prefer an Established Church of any religion, to any religion without an Establishment. Doubtless, many noble Lords hold a similar political

---

\* 'In a country where the law favoured the teachers of no one religion more than another', the sovereign, it is admitted, 'would have no occasion to give himself any concern about them, further than to keep the peace among them in the same manner as among the rest of his subjects; that is, to hinder them from persecuting, abusing, or oppressing one another. But it is quite otherwise where there is an established or governing religion.' *Wealth of Nations*, Book V. c. 1.

faith. Can we be surprised then, that the Irish themselves think that their creed ought to be the established one? According to the theory of an Establishment, it ought to be. We see no escape from the inference, but by denying the expediency or the equity of establishing any. That Protestantism would have spread more and taken deeper root among the people of Ireland, had the Established Church of Ireland, the State religion, been Roman Catholic, we think highly probable. We cannot, however, look at the matter merely as politicians: at all events, we are not politicians of Earl Mansfield's school. We confess that we prefer Religion without an Establishment, under all circumstances, to an Established Church of any religion; more especially, then, of a false religion, or the corruption of the true. We do not deny the power of the Legislature to establish Popery, whether in Ireland or in Canada; or, to borrow Mr. Smith's parallel, its legal competency to endow the priests of Jaggernaut, whether with a pilgrim tax, a *jagheer*, or a Mahratta tithe. But we deny the wisdom, justice, state expediency, or moral utility of such legislation.

In Ireland, the utility of an Ecclesiastical Establishment has been brought to a fair test; and the issue has forced upon the British nation the consideration of the abstract question, which might otherwise have been left to slumber, except as occasionally mooted in the harmless pages of the polemic. The Dissenters of England have not brought on the discussion; nor is it *they* who have, by identifying the Established Church of England with that of Ireland, involved the ultimate fate of both in the political argument. No, it is the advocates of the hierarchy who have, with more heroism than prudence, staked their cause upon this issue. 'It seems somewhat ominous for the cause of Ecclesiastical Establishments in this country', remarks Dr. Heugh, in his masterly pamphlet, 'that they are so linked with one another.

'Were one so small, relatively to the empire, and so moderately expensive, as the Scottish, and which probably includes a majority of the people in this quarter, alone in question, it might, possibly, be endured for generations. But we have the huge English Establishment, with its bishops sitting where they ought not, and uniting with the most disliked of the Peerage against the people and its own anointed king, and its detested tithes, and its obnoxious clergy, and its dissatisfied and half-revolting people from the Church in which they remain. We have the Irish Establishment, the laughing-stock of Europe, regarded as a morbid incubus by the restless people of the island on which it is placed, and now in the process of being *cognosced* by the British parliament. These all make common cause. The Church of Scotland will not now lift her voice against Episcopacy, as she did in the olden time. Then, it was "abjured prelacy": now, it is "the venerable hierarchy". Nor will she tell the King, sitting in the Assembly by



his Commissioner, that it is daring presumption to claim to be head of any church on earth, and that, as he values the permanence of his throne, he should renounce a presumption so offensive in the eyes of Him who is King of kings, and Lord of lords. No, this cannot be. These are not times to agitate after this fashion, the friends of Establishments believe and feel. What will be the result of this perilous coalition ?

In Scotland, the predicament of the Established Church is, in one respect, the reverse of that of the Irish: it is no longer the church of the aristocracy. In Ireland, if the majority of the people are attached to Popery, the wealthier minority profess to adhere to Reformed Episcopacy: in Scotland, Mr. Douglas tells us, 'the wealth of the country has long been Episcopalian'. Yet, notwithstanding the meanness of the dower, the State-alliance has proved not less fatal to the independence and the purity of the Church. 'We have', says Mr. Douglas, 'the bare walls of an Established Church, but the living stones are in every sense absent. The population of the country have gone elsewhere.' The United Secession Church, which has recently celebrated the completion of its Centenary, now numbers more than 400 congregations within its communion, 'besides the numerous and respectable bodies in Ireland and America, which, originating in the labours of Seceders, continue to maintain their principles.'\* And while the non-established Churches, Presbyterian and Episcopal, are thus disputing with the Scottish Establishment, pre-eminence in moral and political strength, to say nothing of the Congregational Body in Scotland, who are rapidly rising in respectability,—all supporting, by voluntary contributions, their own ministers,—the better part of those who remain faithful to the Established Church, are beginning to discover, that repairs are needful in the dilapidated structure, in order to render it much longer tenable, which would probably cost as much as taking it down. In Scotland, as in England, the cry for Church Reform proceeds from *within* the Establishment. There, 'the arrogant and domineering usurpation of lay patronage', is deemed 'the crying abomination'. 'At this moment', says Dr. Heugh, 'this evil is denounced by many of the best men in the Church of Scotland as unscriptural and sinful.

'But what follows? Is this "sinful and unscriptural thing" renounced at all costs? Is entrance into the pastoral relation, or connexion with the State itself, declined, rather than comply with this invasion of the rights of the Christian people, this "sinful and unscriptural usurpation in the church;"—rather than do this "evil that good may come?" No such thing. What has been, *in practice*, exists

---

\* Speech of the Rev. Dr. Brown. Patriot, Dec. 24.



in practice as ever. The king, the town council, the private lay patron, repeat the evil as they were accustomed to do; congregations bow to it, ministers of the Gospel coincide with it, in receiving gratefully the patron's grant as the necessary pre-requisite to the call, or the induction; and the church puts herself into the abject condition of a petitioner to the legislature, to redress an evil which she should abolish herself. How much more dignified, how much more scriptural, to sever by one act the connection, from which nothing but evil has resulted, or will result; and thus at once to lay the axe to the root, in place of cropping the twigs, or lopping off some of the branches. In this way alone, it is probable, will the evil ever be cured; for an Established Church without royal or aristocratical patronage, is an anomaly of which history affords no record.' *Heugh*, pp. 65, 6.

The state of things in Scotland, as regards church-patronage, is thus further exposed in a pamphlet, the writer of which is opposed to 'the Voluntary Principle'; professing that he has 'never yet met with any thing at all approximating to a valid objection to the expediency of the venerable Establishment of that country, or of any other moderately, but competently endowed church.' But he thinks, that it would be expedient to concede to the laity the privilege of nominating their own pastors.

'This privilege, however, lay patronage has wickedly usurped. It takes that matter entirely into its own hands, and impiously decrees, that, till it has inspected and backed his credentials, the ambassador of the Most High shall not enter upon the duties of his benevolent mission, and the perishing sinner shall have no opportunity of listening to the gracious overtures of divine mercy. Quite in keeping, also, with this daring impiety, it further decrees, that the patronage of a parish is a civil right, and may, of course, be held by a civil tenure, and that, accordingly, such patronage may be held by any person entitled to hold civil property; by either a male or a female; a member of the Church of Scotland, or merely one who, without attaching himself to any religious party, approves of the doctrine and discipline of that Church; a Protestant Dissenter or an Independent; an Episcopalian or a Papist; the wildest Sectary, or even an Infidel. And as all these may thus hold the patronage of our Churches, so they may also exercise it. Papists, who were long and jealously excluded from all civil power in this country—and Papists alone—are still excluded from the direct exercise of such patronage: these, however, after all, like the masked assassin, may, through the medium of a commissioner of their own choosing, aim a deadly blow at the liberties of our church.

'One would naturally think that a tame submission to its tyrannical dictates, on the part of the laity, might have very well contented the domineering spirit of lay patronage; such a measure of popular humiliation, however, is not enough for that purpose; the laity are also called upon to hug their spiritual fetters. For this purpose, as often as a new minister has been appointed to a vacant parish, the people are regularly invited to sign a document, called a concurrence,

expressing not simply acquiescence in, but positive approbation of, the appointment. The egregiousness of this mockery will be more apparent, when we call to mind that, whether any such concurrence should be signed or not, the appointment to which it relates must be completed. In the case of an unacceptable presentee, any available remedy would be of a very partial nature; no doubt, a more acceptable person might be nominated by the Presbytery, or by the people with its permission; still, as the Presbytery could induct its own presentee to the spiritual charge only, and as the civil law would sustain the title of the spiritually-rejected presentee to the living, and as, consequently, there would be no special provision for the real pastor, the people would be under the necessity of providing for both. But from all danger of any such heavy infliction, we are happily saved, by the wisdom and prudence of our Church-courts, which always succeed in their benevolent endeavours to make every living accompany the cure of souls to which it is specially attached.

‘ When the purest institution may be perverted, one essentially vile must be peculiarly liable to abuse. Accordingly, could any thing possibly aggravate its innate impiety and daring presumption, it would be the way in which lay patronage is, we fear, but too frequently exercised. Nor is there any one form of that arrogant and domineering usurpation of which this may not be affirmed. The Secretary of the Home Department, who has the disposal of the extensive church-patronage vested in the crown, in appointing a pastor to any particular church, pays little regard to clerical merit, and still less, if possible, to popular edification. But, in the eyes of a Cabinet-Minister, what are either, or even both, of these objects, in comparison of gratifying some staunch parliamentary supporter of every government measure. This important personage, again, in his turn, has some political friend to oblige; members of the Lower House, especially, find the gift of a church a convenient mode of rewarding the political services of some influential constituent, who has an unappointed or a poorly-appointed clerical relation or friend. The numerous livings in the proper gift of our leading nobility and gentry, furnish additional means of extending and consolidating their political and local influence. The great have their family-tutors; these must, in every case, be persons of the most accommodating disposition; learning is not always a necessary recommendation, and, as to real and decided piety, none, save old fashioned families, ever think of insisting upon it; but, whatever the tutor may be, the parish manse affords a ready asylum for his old age. Were it not for the occasional detection of some ill-managed case of simony, some persons would think it uncharitable to suppose that any one could be so very wicked as to purchase a living; but, for our own part, we cannot comprehend why patrons should not be permitted to take money for a presentation as well as to barter it for any political or other commodity.

‘ Church-patronage, besides, like any other property, may be held by distinct proprietors, and, accordingly, in many cases, it is so held. When the patrons are only two in number, such as, for example, the crown and a subject, or two subjects, or a collective body and an individual subject, or two collective bodies, the right of presentation is



alternately exercised by each, and is, consequently, as liable to abuse as when it is vested in either singly. Town-Councils, by an occasional church appointment, do what they can to sustain their wonted and well-earned reputation for jobbing. Even Heads of Universities are not always so disinterested as to give away a church merely to reward piety or even learning. But the most wildly-luxuriant form of lay patronage is, when it is vested in Incorporations at large, or in the whole of the Heritors of a parish; here its exercise from the rancour and malice it unavoidably calls forth, bears a more striking resemblance to a contested election of the Deacon of some thriving Trade, than to the choice of a spiritual overseer, and for particular instances of this scandalous conduct, we have only to refer to the unfortunate and far-famed parishes of Calder and Rutherglen, both in the presbytery of Glasgow. The present Sir Robert Peel, during his home-Secretaryship, uniformly presented the clergyman most acceptable to the majority of Heritors in a vacant parish, and, no doubt, thought that in so doing, he was promoting the real interests of our church; but, alas, however creditable to himself such a motive certainly was, he must have known little of heritors' pastoral elections. And here also we may observe, that the greater the number of patrons for any particular church, so also the more aggravated will be the evils resulting from the exercise of their joint patronage. The spirit of party has an unhappy tendency to blunt the sense of moral obligation, and as if the guilt of an offence were capable of being shared amongst the joint perpetrators, men will generally go to greater lengths in iniquity in a social than in an individual capacity.'

'The most comparatively-promising form of lay patronage, is that supported by the "Society for improving the system of Church-Patronage in Scotland"—a Society that has never been popular, and that, of course, has done little, if any, good. Nor is the reason of this far to seek; it courts our notice in the self-contradictory designation of the Society itself, and simple in the extreme, must be the person who does not know that lay patronage is essentially bad, and, consequently, incapable of being at all improved. Improve lay patronage as you will, your labour must always be in vain; the thing after all, will never be any thing but lay patronage. Accordingly, the peculiar plan of the Anti-Patronage Society, as it is usually, but improperly styled, upon a close and unprejudiced examination, will be found altogether unsatisfactory and inexpedient.'

'Such is the monstrous spiritual usurpation which has now too long enthralled this once happy kingdom—such the abject and impious homage which it rigidly exacts from all the clerical, and from all the lay, members of our established church—such the all-grasping domination from which the erection of even Chapels of Ease is unable to rescue us. And if the mere general outline which we have now given of its execrable tyranny, were filled up with more particular delineations, the representation would be still more shockingly-repulsive. Besides, to complete our misery, lay patronage is not a recent usurpation which has not, as yet, had time to extend and consolidate itself; in the far-protracted vista of the authentic history of the past, we dimly descry it sternly endeavouring to enslave our pious and patriotic



forefathers, and these we also positively discern once and again as sternly defending their spiritual independence, whilst, in the intervening distance, we see the arduous struggle at length terminate in the complete subjugation of our more immediate and more degenerate ancestors. For upwards now of a century, this tyranny has been the desolating scourge and the bitterest curse of our church, and the fruitful source of those flagrant and numerous corruptions which grieve her real friends, and rejoice and increase her enemies. This intolerable grievance under which we have so long groaned, is the most powerful Auxiliary of Voluntary Church Associations. But in such Associations alone are we still to look for refuge? Must we either abandon our spiritual mother in the extremity of her long-protracted distress, or with her be for ever doomed to the most hopeless slavery? Must our filial virtue and devotion be actually tested with such a dreadful alternative? No, thanks be to Heaven, they need not, or if they should, it must be our own personal fault. The magnanimous and invincible spirit of our sires, has long slumbered in inglorious inactivity, but has now at length awakened, and giant-like it will soon shake off the mighty incubus that has so long oppressed it and weighed it down to the dust. That extensive and influential portion of our countrymen, who already are, or who long to become pious members of our venerable establishment, are now fully prepared to assert and to vindicate their religious liberty. They have caught the spirit of the age, and they will never rest till their complete deliverance shall have been achieved, and till their spiritual independence shall have been placed upon such a sure foundation as will defy the fury of every future assault.' *First Blast*, pp. 28—37.

We are told, further on, that nearly all the representatives for Scotland in the House of Commons are positively *pledged* to do all in their power for the entire abolition of lay patronage. Now when it is recollected that those representatives are, for the most part, members of the Established Church of Scotland, many of them pious and patriotic members of that Church, one might conclude that the strong determination in favour of the necessity of a church reform there, will not be easily put down. But this Writer anticipates that every practicable stratagem will be employed to defeat the most energetic endeavours of the reformers. '*That antiquated faction who so long misruled these realms*, yet seems,' he remarks, '*to cling to the hope of recovering its wonted ascendancy.*' '*Lay patronage, like every other tyranny, clings to its supremacy.*'

'We are told that the present system works well, and so it assuredly does for the worldly views of many church-patrons and clerical drones. But some patrons have made a good use of their power, which possibly they have in certain cases from prudential motives. Worldly men will frequently act from such motives. In populous neighbourhoods, and particularly in large towns, deference to influential friends, or rivalry of dissenters, or the advantage of having the seats of a church well-let, or the view of increasing the poor's funds, by church-door collections,

or all of these, may influence pastoral appointments. Some of these motives will even weigh in a small country parish. Or the patron may even be a pious person, and, consequently, prefer a meritorious clergyman. Still, however, in all these cases, what was really a matter of positive right, has been conferred as a mere boon. Those who can tamely submit to such degrading vassalage, deserve to remain in perpetual slavery. Away for ever then with the foolery of talking about the good which lay patronage has done; nor even presume to tell us of the good which it has generously permitted to be done. On the contrary, were it here necessary, or even desirable, we could tell you of the good that has been actually done in spite of it, and of the still greater amount of good that, but for the wicked and mischievous interference, might have possibly been done. To say that we have yet a goodly number of pious and learned ministers—men, in some measure, worthy of their important office, and in a tolerably-competent degree qualified to discharge its arduous duties, is saying nothing that can be possibly placed to the credit of lay patronage, it is merely saying, that God has not yet entirely cast off his highly-favoured, though ungrateful people—that he did not, as some of our Seceders uncharitably imagine, actually forsake the Church of Scotland, when they themselves thought fit to leave it.' *First Blast*, &c. pp. 37, 8.

It is important to bear in mind, that this is not the language of Dissenters or Seceders, but of Churchmen; not of the advocates, but of the opponents of the Voluntary Principle. But, if such be the admissions of Churchmen, can we consider that those who have seceded from the Establishment, and who have proved the superior efficiency of the Voluntary Principle for a century, should be prepared to go a little further, and deem that the shortest way of going to work, and the best, would be for the Church to renounce at once State patronage and State support. For, as Dr. Heugh remarks, an Established Church, without royal or aristocratical patronage, is an anomaly. On the other hand, Paley argues, that 'wheresoever this constitution of patronage is adopted, a national religion must always necessarily accompany it.' In other words, the interference of the State, in determining what form of religion shall be taught, is necessitated by the constitution which deprives the people of the right of choice, as '*a restriction upon the exercise of private patronage.*' 'If it be necessary', says the learned Dean, 'that the point be determined for the inhabitants by any other will than their own', (that is, the point what religion, or what sort of religious instructor, shall be established in a particular district,) 'it is surely better that it should be determined by a deliberate resolution of the Legislature, than by the casual inclination of an individual by whom the right is purchased, or to whom it devolves as a mere secular inheritance.' But, that any party other than the people themselves should have the power of determining this, is the usurpation, the intolerable grievance complained of.

The only difference of opinion which distinguishes the Seceder from the Dissenter in Scotland,—that is, the Establishment-man from the Voluntary Principle man, is, whether this system of patronage is, or is not, essentially intertwined with the very fabric of the Establishment. Our readers are, we presume, aware, that the Scotch Seceders, like the Wesleyans in this country, have generally disclaimed the name of Dissenters. The founders of the Secession ‘stated no controversy with the doctrines, worship, discipline, or government of the Church, as laid down in her public standards. Neither did they leave her because she was ‘an *established Church*.’ We have before us, *Two Discourses*, by a Seceding Minister of the old School, upon the ‘Causes, Influence, and Prospects of the Secession’, in which the reverend Writer deprecates and deplors the silent but rapid progress, within his own body, during the last thirty years, of opinions hostile to all Establishments of religion. ‘They are now’, he pathetically complains of the larger portion of his brethren, ‘Dissenters in the land, and not Seceders.’ Yet, the terms in which he contends for the people’s right to choose their pastors, would be mistaken by almost any Advocate of Church Establishments in *this country*, as the language of an uncompromising Dissenter.

‘Our Seceding forefathers’, says Mr. Mackray, ‘instead of settling down on the principle of those acts’, (the acts of 1649 and 1690, vesting the right of *nomination* in the Session, or with the Elders and Heritors,) ‘wisely adopted the broad Scriptural principle of popular right. In doing so, they took their firm station on the institution of Jesus Christ, embodied in the administration of his apostles; and the successful operation of their principle has been apparent to the whole country for a hundred years. I confess, I have often been astonished to find the advocates of Patronage alleging, on behalf of their system, the confusions and contentions of which the popular plan has been productive. It is by no means wonderful, that, in cases of popular choice, occurring in the Established Church at long intervals, there should be occasionally scenes of contention and dispute. At the same time, these are comparatively rare; and if the principle were brought into universal operation, as it has been in the Secession, they would, undoubtedly, become much more so. And, for my own part, I cannot conceive how any candid man, with the history of the Secession before his eyes, could doubt the successful operation of the popular plan. It is no new untried experiment, like the much boasted “voluntary” system of present times. It was tried, in point of fact, in the Church herself during her best days, and the consequences of the trial were most auspicious for the country. It has been tried in the Secession during a hundred years, and her history furnishes irrefragable proof of its beneficial operation. That there have been differences of sentiment among the members of her congregations—that there have been disputes and contentions among them on this point—



cannot, and needs not, be denied ; but they have been comparatively few in number, and their consequences have not been permanently injurious. A *call* in the Secession has been, in the vast majority of instances, from its beginning until now, either altogether or almost *unanimous*. It is idle, however, to dwell on this point. In spite of the declamation of the defenders of Patronage, the people of Scotland are beginning to open their eyes on the respective merits of the two systems. They can contrast, as well as those who desire to lead them, the operation of the one principle in the Church, and of the other in the Secession. They can ascertain for themselves, under which of them it has been, that the respective Churches have been most deeply injured—congregations shattered—and thousands of Christian people driven from their former ecclesiastical communion. And, instructed by the experience of past times, in the unhappy influence of this long-cherished plague of the Church, I do fondly hope, for the welfare of our beloved land in generations yet to come, that they will not cease from their remonstrances against it, till they shall have triumphantly achieved its final extinction.

*Mackray on the Causes, &c. pp. 35, 6.*

Again :

‘ To tell me that I have a right to choose the persons I am to employ in the concerns of this world, but that I have no right to interfere in choosing the man to whom I confide my dearest, my spiritual and everlasting interests, is surely a sentiment deeply insulting to any rational mind. In vain are we told, that the ordinary classes of the people are not qualified to judge respecting the talents and accomplishments of ministers of the Church. If there *are* dark and desolate parishes, respecting which this assertion is true, I hesitate not to say, that they have been brought into this dismal state through the operation of the very principle of which we are presently speaking. But, for my own part, I would repel the idea, as a foul libel on the people of our land. I believe, that, at the period in question, the people of Scotland were infinitely better qualified to judge in this matter, than the great majority of those who claimed the right of presentation. If there *were* religious knowledge and religious principle in the land, they were to be found among the ordinary classes of society.’ *Ib.* p. 11.

The period referred to in this last paragraph was the year 1712, when the system of lay patronage, which had been abolished in the second reformation of 1638—1658, but revived at the Restoration, and again abolished at the Revolution of 1688, was once more revived by the Parliament of Queen Anne ; to which circumstance, the Secession chiefly owes its origin. The anti-patronage reformers have, therefore, precedents on their side, of no light authority ; and historical facts might seem to warrant their position, that Royal or Aristocratical Patronage is *not* essential to the constitution of an Established Church. In Scotland, indeed, the Church was never reduced to such complete vassalage as in this country. ‘ The Scottish Church,’ says Dr. Heugh, ‘ never owned the King as her head,—and may she never !—and never

‘surrendered the independence of her courts and her discipline.’ Still, the *authority* of the Civil Magistrate in matters ecclesiastical, is expressly recognized in the Scottish formularies. Besides, wherever there exists a State-provision for the clergy, the State must exercise the assumed right of determining what form of doctrine shall be received into the national code, and enforced by the national sanction. Either some one sect must be selected as the endowed order, and the same legislative restriction be laid upon the popular choice, that is now laid upon the exercise of private patronage; or, the State provision must be indifferently extended to all sects and persuasions. Now it is in this very assumption of *either legislative or judicial* authority in matters of conscience on the part of the civil authorities, that the strongest religious objection against the principles of Ecclesiastical Establishments consists. We say, the strongest *religious* objection, because it is doubtless a powerful political objection, as urged by the Author of the pamphlet on the Case of the Dissenters, that the preference of one denomination of religionists before others, by the State, involves injustice, and is a grievance, to Dissenters of every description, to whom, in this point of view, an Establishment must work injuriously. The grievance is thus forcibly stated.

‘An Establishment, as it exists in Britain, is the selection of one denomination of Christians from amongst many, to participate in the favour of the State. As an expression of this favour, it is taken into close alliance with the State; it is supported by the property of the State; it has not only a virtual, but a positive and personal representation in the parliament of the State; its discipline is enforced by the power of the State; and it is indulged by the State, with manifold and exclusive privileges. Now it is evident, that such a civil establishment of *religion* is not to be confounded with *religion itself*. It is not a *part* of religion; it is not *co-extensive* with the subjects of true religion, or the members of the true Church. If these favours of the State were transferred to the seceders, it would not make them more a church than they are; and were they withdrawn from the Episcopalians, it could not make them less so. The episcopal portion of the church would still have her bishops, her priests, her deacons, her temples, her congregations, her formularies, and her private endowments. She would only be left, as the dissenting communities now are, to be guided by her own counsels, and to be sustained by her own resources. Whether a body of Christians, then, is the better or the worse for such a *civil* establishment, is fairly open to opinion and discussion. The Churchman, while the distinction is his, may think it beneficial, but he libels his church when he makes it essential to her life and prosperity; and the Dissenter may think it injurious; and in that judgment, while conscientiously opposing all civil establishments of religion, he may be truly seeking to promote the interests of the Church at large, and of the episcopal portion of it in particular.’



‘ Partiality has ever been denounced as of the essence of bad government : it is bad in civil affairs ; it is intolerable in those of religion. Yet to this evil an Establishment exposes us. The professor of the State religion is, on the mere ground of his profession, placed nearer to Majesty ; he is one of a privileged fraternity ; he is pointed out to the community as the more correct, the safer, and every way the better man ; and exaction, in some form or other, is at hand to uphold his pretensions. As he is exalted, the seceder is necessarily degraded. A cloud stands between him and the face of Royalty : he does not belong to the king’s church, and he is hardly thought to be true to the king’s person ; and he is treated as though he held a “divided allegiance,” and was not to be fully trusted ; certainly not to be trusted equally with a conformist. It is impossible to say what he has not suffered from this cause in *estate*, in *reputation*, and in *good-fellowship*.

‘ And can any thing exceed this in exasperation ? If it were some one definite evil, to be endured at some one time of one’s life, for worshipping according to one’s conscience, however great, it might be bravely borne ; but when it is an evil pursuing one, in its subtle and malignant influence, through every path and every hour of life ; when it gives one a *lower place* in the *settled* opinion of one’s fellow citizens ; when it dishonours us at the exchange, at the college, in the senate, in the pulpit ; when it worms itself into the paradise of home, and breeds discord or indifference between parent and child, brother and sister ; who can bear it ? It is the continual dropping that wears the stone. The storm might fall on it—the lightning might strike it—it is unhurt ; but this continued vexation chafes and corrodes even a stone !

‘ And it is to be observed, that this evil, the greatest a generous spirit can know, must exist under the *mildest form* of an Establishment. Wherever there is a National Establishment, there must be *Toleration* ; and toleration, though the boast of the Churchman, is the abhorrence of the Dissenter. To tolerate a man in a given action is to *permit* him to do it ; and to permit him, involves the right to *prevent* him ; and when these relate to an act *purely religious*, they are alike odious and execrable. To permit a man, forsooth, to worship God according to his conscience !

‘ If it is the tendency of a National Establishment to create irritation, discontent, and resentment on the mind of the separatist ; it as certainly leads, on the part of the favoured conformist, to pride, contempt, and intolerance. Sad and abundant proof, that it has worked, *as a system*, most powerfully to such an end, is everywhere to be found. I rejoice to know that there are most charming exceptions ; but we have now, not to treat of the exceptions, but of the rule. The Dissenters *as a body*, have uniformly been treated by the endowed Church *as a body*, with scorn, contumely, and hate. No epithets, however low, have been too low, by which to degrade their profession, their pastors, and their institutions : whatever exemptions they have obtained from the cruellest exactions and the most unjust persecutions, they have obtained, not at the christian intercession of the Church, but in the face of her frowning and determined resistance : and had



the high and true Churchman had his way, not a resting-place would have been left to them on British soil.'

*Case of the Dissenters*, pp. 22—29.

This is the grievance; but, as we have already remarked, it does not constitute the religious, and therefore the higher, as well as antecedent objection against the principle which makes the civil magistrate an arbiter of religious truth, and attributes to any human legislature authority in matters of faith. The old Seceders held, upon this point, notions tending very strongly to intolerance; and the Westminster Confession certainly holds language which would sanction the most arbitrary and violent proceedings. It is there laid down, that the civil magistrate 'hath authority, and it is his duty, to take order, that unity and peace be preserved in the Church; that the truth of God be kept pure and entire; that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed, all corruptions and abuses in worship and discipline prevented or reformed; and all the ordinances of God duly settled, administered and observed; for the better effecting whereof he hath power to call synods, to be present at them, and to provide that *whatsoever is transacted in them*, be according to the mind of God.\* Wherein does this differ from the pretensions of the Man of Sin, except as it places the emperor or king, instead of the infallible priest, on the synodical throne, and makes the civil magistrate, instead of the spiritual power, the judge and persecutor of heresy?

Mr. Mackray, however, considers the expunging of this doctrine from the creed of the Secession Church, as overthrowing 'the fundamental ground of a Secession!!' He waives, in the publication before us, entering fully into the question of 'the duty of Christian magistrates, in their official capacity, to countenance and support the Church of Christ.' 'At present', he continues,

'I shall only say, that it does seem to me a doctrine altogether reasonable and scriptural, that the Christian magistrate, though he may

---

\* Westminster Confession, Ch. xxiii. §. 3. The Scripture proofs, by which, according to the biblical reasoning of the times, this declaration of the civil magistrate's 'duty respecting the Church and Religion' is supported, leave no doubt as to the principles maintained by its framers. The passages referred to are those in the Mosaic code which denounce capital punishment upon the blasphemer, false prophet, or idolater; the decree of Artaxerxes authorizing Ezra to inflict death, banishment, or confiscation upon whosoever should not do the law of his God and the law of his king, (a heathen authority!) and the account of the reforms effected by kings Josiah and Jehoshaphat.

not officially assume any authority in the church, ought to befriend her interests, to provide for the maintenance of her institutions throughout his realm, and to protect, by legislative enactments, the sacredness of her Sabbaths and other ordinances; and I regard this interference on the part of the magistrate about the interests of the church, as altogether consistent with the rights of conscience, and the just liberties of mankind. And I cannot refrain, at the same time, from expressing my conviction, in reference to our beloved land, that the bringing into practical operation amongst us principles of another kind—according to which religion would be expunged from our national constitution—all legislation about the interests of religion forbidden—all connexion between the church and the state abolished—all legal support for the maintenance of religious institutions withdrawn—and the very sacredness of God's holy day thrown open to the profanations of the ungodly,—how much soever such a scheme of reformation may by multitudes be now extolled, would be to place us as a nation in the attitude of impious rebellion against God and against his Anointed—to sweep away the most valuable institutions in the land, and to pave the way for the triumph of ignorance, irreligion, and infidelity.' *Mackray*, pp. 40, 41.

We have deemed it worth while to transcribe this *tirade*, as a specimen of the empty fulminations which, for lack of arguments, are hurled upon the heads of those who would deprive the civil magistrate of the sacred and divine prerogative of persecution. There is some method, however, in the Writer's anger, for he has dexterously shuffled together the Sabbath and the tithe, civil protection and fiscal exaction, legislation and magistracy, and then defied us to touch the false jewels that he has mingled with the regalia. We admit that it is a delicate topic; and language has been held by some of the opponents of religious establishments, which is open, at least, to unfavourable construction. Far be it from us to maintain, that the State has nothing to do with religion, or that civil governors or legislatures ought not to concern themselves about the religious interests of their subjects. Our creed as to the duty of the Christian magistrate respecting the Church and religion, is just this; that he is bound to recognize, as in his personal conduct, so in his official capacity, all the obligations of Christian duty,—to protect all classes in the enjoyment of their religious privileges, and in the performance of the duties involved in their notions of religious obedience,—to hinder the religionists of one sect from persecuting, abusing, or oppressing those of another,—to prevent the poor man from being robbed or defrauded of God's holy day;—in short, to give all the countenance, aid, and protection to religion that human laws can give, without assuming a lordship over conscience, that belongs not to Cæsar, and losing sight of the just limits and proper end of civil government,—the protection of personal rights,

the social welfare of all classes, and the peace and quiet of the community.

‘It is objected,’ says Dr. Heugh, ‘that our doctrine is at war with national schools, a national Sabbath, and, indeed, national religion itself. We deny all these assertions. There may be universal education, as in America, where there is no Established Church; and there may be the want of such education, as in England, where an Established Church has existed for centuries. As an institution essential to the welfare of the nation, the Sabbath may be, and ought to be, set apart from secular labour; but it is not pretended, that law can compel its religious observance.’ *Heugh*, p. 73.

The establishment of religion and the establishment of a church, are two things as widely distinct, as are the establishment of social order and the establishment of a standing army. ‘A religious Establishment,’ says Paley, ‘is no part of Christianity: it is only the means of inculcating it.’ The question is, Is it the best means? If the affirmative could be proved, then, a religious Establishment that should be adapted to this simple object, would, we do not hesitate to admit, be defensible. The political objection against such an institution, founded upon its incidental operation as a grievance to individuals, would lose at least much of its force. We must confess our opinion that too great prominence has sometimes been given to the political objection founded on the injustice involved in an Establishment. ‘It would undoubtedly,’ remarks the Author of the Letter to the Chancellor, ‘have been some consolation to the Dissenter, if he had found, after all he had suffered on the account of an Establishment, that it had, in the same proportion, benefited the Church. But he is deprived even of this relief; for, to say the least, it has been as injurious to the Church herself, as to those who withdraw from her communion.’ This is the ground on which we would take our stand. We complain of the unjust and injurious operation of an Establishment upon Dissenters, because it is not compensated by any adequate benefit to the community; because it fails to accomplish the professed end of its institution, that end being better accomplished under other circumstances:—for, after all, an Establishment is not, properly speaking, a means of instruction, but only a circumstance, a political circumstance, attaching to the provision. We again cite with pleasure Dr. Heugh.

‘What has accomplished, under God, the advantages to the souls of men which have been enjoyed within the Established Churches? Is it any thing else than revealed truth, and the ordinances of Christian worship, the administration of which they enjoy? Surely it is not the legal establishment of these Churches,—it is not tithes, royal ordi-



nances, and Acts of Parliament, that have instructed, reformed, and comforted the worshippers. The support of Christian teachers by the state, has no more produced those results, than the presentation of these teachers by that *patronage* which is now so generally condemned. Were the funds for the support of the teachers, and the erection of the edifices, derived not from the state, but from the worshippers, the same spiritual processes would be going forward under their ministry. I do not now enquire whether most good is done in dissenting, or in endowed Churches; but it will be conceded at once, that the same sort of results follows the same sort of instruction among dissenters as among churchmen. The good then, is not doing by virtue of the Establishment; but by the truth and ordinances of Christ Jesus, which can be administered without a legal Establishment, as well as under it.—And then, as to eminent men, would intellect lose its lustre, talent its power, goodness its worth, by passing the precincts of the Establishment? Were Bates, Howe, Baxter, Doddridge, less illustrious than Tillotson, Chillingworth, Barrow, or Scott? Or could Hall have been greater in Lambeth than in Bristol?

‘It is no reason why the dissenters should receive a legal Establishment, that so much good has been effected by their labours, that talent has been found among their pastors, and so much Christian worth among their people: neither is there any reason why the endowed Churches should continue on similar grounds to hold their exclusive endowments.’ *Heugh*, pp. 10, 11.

The fundamental religious objection against the establishment of a Church is, that it does not tend to establish religion, but to fetter and corrupt it. Of this, the sad evidences are to be read in every page of ecclesiastical history. But we need not push back our researches very far. What means the cry of Church Reform? Look at the rank and luxuriant growth of Popery in Ireland, under the dark shadow of the richest Protestant Establishment in Europe. Look at the slow decline and deterioration of the purest Protestant Church in Christendom,—the Scottish. Look at the relative position of the Anglican Church, sinking under the weight of its own wealth, and dealing forth angry invectives against the more active sectaries for doing her own work. There we may see thrice exemplified, under singularly varied circumstances, the unhappy effects of a Church Establishment. The histories of all monopolies, civil or ecclesiastical, speak the same lesson. The *protection* of the State, religion demands. The *patronage* of the State has always proved fatal to her purity and vitality. A Church Establishment is *essentially* a system of patronage, and one that has never succeeded.

This is the essential character of an Establishment, viewed merely as a fixed national provision for the maintenance of an order of public instructors. But, although it may suit the purpose of the modern apologists for Establishments, to take this mild hypothetical view, it cannot be concealed, and must not be for-

gotten, that the true theory upon which Established Churches are grounded, is the authority of the civil magistrate, or legislature, in matters of faith, including the right and duty of punishing all heretics and schismatics. 'Toleration in every form,' it has been justly remarked, 'is inconsistent with a National Establishment: it is, in fact, a toleration to disobedience.' Toleration is a modern innovation introduced by civil governors in opposition to the claims of the Church Established. Establishments know nothing of toleration. The Reformers, for the most part, eschewed it. The Westminster Confession disclaims it. The English Establishment had its foundation laid in penal laws, which punished Nonconformity as a crime, and heresy as high treason. Consistently was the Jewish theocracy held forth as a model; for, under it, toleration was unknown, and religious disobedience was punished with death. The precedent, could it be proved to be binding upon Christian Governments, would not merely sanction an exclusive Establishment, but would forbid toleration. The Jewish polity affords no precedent, indeed, for the compulsive enforcement of an arbitrary tithe, but it *does* for putting to death blasphemers, adulterers, idolaters, and Sabbath-breakers. Either, then, the precedent so partially followed out, is altogether fallacious, or toleration is a crime. It is scarcely possible to estimate the injury to religion that has resulted from the grossly absurd, but once prevalent notion, which made the miraculous dispensation of God with the Jewish nation, a rule of human legislation and government. The pernicious blunder has been at once a stumbling-block and a triumph to the infidel; while Christianity, tried by the Jewish law, has, like her Divine Author, been adjudged guilty of blasphemy, and then handed over to the civil power, as a traitor.

That the National Church of England was designed to correspond to the Jewish model, is clear from the language of its champions. 'Our State,' says Hooker, 'is according to the pattern of God's own ancient elect people; which people was not *part* of them the common wealth, and *part* of them the church of God; but the self-same people whole and entire, were both, under one chief governor, on whose supreme authority they did all depend.\*' According to this high authority, the fundamental principle of the Church of Elizabeth was, that 'there is not a man of the church of England, but the same man is also a member of the commonwealth; nor any member of the commonwealth, which is not also of the Church of England.' 'No person appertaining to the one could be denied to be also of the other.†' The law knew nothing of Nonconformists but as

\* Eccl. Polity, B. viii. § i. Vol. III. (Hanbury's ed.) p. 262.

† *Ib.* Vol. III. p. 254.



‘criminals, to be dealt with by imprisonment, banishment, and, ‘in case of return, death.’ A writer in the November No. of the “*British Magazine*,” the oracle of the High Church party, after citing the above language of Hooker, transcribes at length the 35 Elizabeth, (A.D. 1592,) containing those atrocious enactments, ‘as a proof that Hooker was not trifling with himself, ‘in thus identifying the Commonwealth and the Church of ‘England.’ He then adds :

‘This act, it must be admitted, is sufficiently to the point. Persecuting it may be called, unjust and atrocious, if the reader pleases ; but it is, at any rate, decisive. It goes straight to the point, and empowers the magistrates and clergy to drive out Dissenters, Roman Catholic or Protestant alike, all who choose to withhold themselves from the worship of the Church of England : in short, if rigorously enforced, it ensures the identity of the Church and the Commonwealth.

‘Here, then, we have a formal acknowledgment of the principle on which Hooker justified the then existing relations of Church and State, a ratification of the condition on which he consented to parliamentary interference in matters spiritual.

‘Although this act was finally repealed in 1688, still, the principle on which it was founded was allowed to survive it. Three other acts, which had been founded on the same principle, were allowed to continue in force : viz. (1.) An act made in the 13th year of Charles II., “for the well-governing and regulation of corporations.” (2.) An act made in the 25th year of Charles II., “for preventing dangers which may happen from Popish recreants.” (3.) An act made in the 30th year of Charles II., “for the more effectual preserving of the king’s person and government by disabling Papists from sitting in either house of parliament.” And till these acts were repealed, the condition on which Hooker insists was not thoroughly cancelled. . . . His argument was indeed in some respects weakened by act of toleration, in 1688, but still it was not entirely overthrown. From that time the Commonwealth did indeed cease to be identical with the Church ; but parliament did not cease, at least did not entirely cease, to represent the Church ; it was still, by virtue of the foregoing acts, in some sense at least, a lay synod of the Church. By the 13th of Charles II. the government of all corporations had been consigned into the hands, not merely of churchmen, but of communicants ; by the 25th, the crown was protected from all dissenting influences by the exclusion of all except communicants from every office held directly or indirectly by royal appointment ; and by the 30th, the most influential body of Dissenters, i. e. the Roman Catholics, were shut out from either house of parliament. And, till the repeal of these acts, it is clear that vigilance on the part of the Church might have secured for itself at least a very strong party in the House of Commons.

‘The Church, however, was not vigilant, and two, at least, of these important acts were allowed to fall into disuse. In the 5th year of George I. it was enacted, by a House of Commons in which the Church ought to have retained an ascendancy, “that elections into corporate



offices shall not be void on account of the person elected having omitted to communicate within a year of the election, unless he shall be removed within six months of the election, or unless a prosecution shall be commenced within that time and be carried on without delay." In the 9th year of George II. a further act was passed, "indemnifying all those who, though not communicants, held offices which were restricted to communicants." And subsequently it became a regular practice to pass an act of "indemnity" every session of parliament. At length, in 1828, men had so completely forgotten the principles on which Church and State were anciently united, that the 13th and 25th of Charles II., viz. the test and corporation acts, were repealed, almost without opposition, and the year following, the Roman Catholics were admitted to seats in parliament. In 1832, the extinction of the Irish Protestant boroughs, and the great power accidentally given to Dissenters, by the reform act, gave a concluding blow to the ancient system. And in 1833, we have witnessed the assembling of a parliament in which few perhaps can detect the traces of a lay synod of the Church of England.

'To revert, then, to the original proposition, it does appear that, according to Hooker, our civil legislature is no longer qualified, as it formerly was, to be our ecclesiastical legislature; that the conditions on which our predecessors consented to parliamentary interference in matters spiritual are cancelled.'

Such is, briefly, the history of the progress of Toleration in England; of that Toleration which the abhorrent Church has at every stage resisted, and which is admitted by this high-church writer to have subverted the fundamental principle of the boasted alliance between Church and State. The object of his article is manifestly to impugn the legislative sovereignty of the British Parliament; a point which we leave him to argue with the lawyers. He has, however, undesignedly shewn how untenable is Warburton's paradoxical and fallacious theory, which vindicates that Alliance upon opposite principles. 'To punish sectaries in order to bring them over to the national religion,' says the Bishop, 'is *plainly iniquitous*.' 'The civil magistrate, as such, hath no right to determine which is the true religion, this power not being given him on man's entering into Society. Nor could it be given him, because one man cannot empower another to determine for him in matters of religion . . . . Were the magistrate a judge of what was true religion, he would yet have no right to reward its followers, or to discourage its opposers.' Further, the learned Prelate admits, that 'the clergy's right to a public maintenance,' if intended 'for the support of opinions, would be contrary to the fundamental laws of society, by making men contribute to the maintenance of opinions which they reject and think false.' A test-law, on the *common hypothesis*, would, he says, be 'absolutely unjust, directly tending to the

‘destruction of religious liberty,’ leading men to ‘think hardly of an established religion having such a foundation,’ and tending ‘to the destruction of both.’\* Need the Dissenters of this country desire a better expositor of their objections against Ecclesiastical Establishments, than the pen of this Prelate has supplied?

But Warburton, it seems, did not understand the matter. The Fellow of St. Peter’s College tells us, that the Bishop ‘clearly saw the *alliance*, but he did not see the principle of national religion, nor the constitution of a State independent of its repeated *transgression*!’ His ‘impetuous errors might have been avoided . . . had he seen the meaning of Estate, *symbolically* and *actually*, and in what sense the representatives of an estate are called the estate itself.’ Possibly, our readers may not understand this language. We must therefore indulge them with a further exposition of the Author’s views of National Religion.

‘But now for the *apostacy* of the cry of “no union between Church and State.” National apostacy is simply undoing that, which we have represented as done by Alfred and his council, in this country; for the cry, “no union,” sends back again the missionaries of Christianity to the sea-shore, and nationally bids them build huts, or beg for shelter, and speed how they may. But it also sends them back with a grievous charge against Him they call Lord and Master:—that His faith has been nationally tried, and that His Church has been declared incapable of affording national education, and of giving assistance as the third estate of the nation. We then become no longer a Christian nation, whatever number of individual citizens may follow the degraded Clergy to the sea-shore. But far be this, say the raisers of the apostate cry, we wish still to be a Christian nation. The question then is, whose definition of a Christian is to be taken? otherwise the nation may have “a name to live and yet be dead.” The Apostolic Church of Christ says, I have a commission to make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever the Divine Head of the Church hath commanded me: and among these commandments is the authorized administration of the communion of His body and blood, without which there is no Christian life. A Christian, therefore, says the Church, is one who is thus baptised *duly*, and thus *duly* sustained. And the Church has no other definition to give;—if she be false to this witness for the sake of keeping her temporalities;—if she become the witness of man’s opposition, and Core’s gainsaying, rather than of the Lord’s commission entrusted to her, “and of the good professions He witnessed before Pontius Pilate:”—if she allow the name of Christian, thus defined, to be taken by any readers of the Scriptures she has translated and circulated;—if she allow any

---

\* Warburton’s *Alliance*, B. iii. c. 4. cited in Conder on Protest. Nonconformity, B. iv.



water to be called the water of baptism, by virtue of some verses out of these Scriptures being read by any one over it;—if she allow any wine and any bread to be sacramental;—she is the very leader in the apostasy of the last times, and may herself tremble at the question which has a most powerful application to our spiritual, as it had to the legal, dispensation: “When the Son of man cometh shall He find faith upon the earth?”

‘Now this apostasy began under William III, and was largely augmented, when “religious liberty,” *i. e.* according to modern acceptation *freedom from religion* defined by the Church of Christ, breathed more freely by the repeal of the “Test and Corporation Act.” Thank God, however faithless individuals in the Church were on this occasion, and I in my passive ignorance was one, there was a sacred protest made by all the healthy members of the Church, in behalf of the ordained definition of Christian communion.’ pp. 193—196.

‘As religion *ties together*, or unties things external with motives spiritual, infidelity which unites this union, is the antagonist of religion. Now, every baptized individual consisting of soul and body, is in himself an epitome of the union between Church and State: his spiritual soul, quickened and informed by the Spirit of Christ, is his *Church*;—his body, regulated by the soul thus sanctified and blessed to the enlightening of the understanding, and the resurrection of the reason, is his *state*. The question is: *may* the soul when highly enlightened, give light to the body, as it is *universally* allowed to do, when *not* highly enlightened, or rather when in sensual darkness,—unless the body be considered as self-moved matter? Again, when many bodies are in one society, may their souls be highly enlightened, or must they necessarily in societies forego that light, which shines upon them as individuals? The body politic must move about as an animal, or as directed by an enlightened soul: is that soul to be enlightened by the best or by inferior light? Is the light of Christ the best light? Is the *matter* of the state to be moved by the Spirit of Christ, or of Antichrist, or by no spirit at all?’ p. 185, 6.

Once more: speaking of the ‘*atheistic*’ cry for the expulsion of the Bishops from the House of Lords, Mr. Smith says:

‘Now the “ancestral” Church \* of this Realm, its third venerable estate, is as much of an estate as that of the Aristocracy and Commons; nay, more solemnly so, inasmuch as it is an estate, which informs and perfects the other two, and leads them with itself to unfading realities, so that we may, indeed, in this sense say, “*Nullum tempus occurrit ecclesiæ.*” Nor was this ancestral Church lost by being perfected in Christ’s Church, any more than the Aristocracy and Commons were constitutionally destroyed by becoming Christian; and though but

---

\* This phrase is borrowed from Coleridge, whose ‘idea of the National Church,’ of which Christianity is ‘a blessed *accident*,’ is the evident groundwork of Mr. Smith’s still more muddy metaphysico-politics. See, for a review of Coleridge’s ‘Constitution of Church and State,’ Ecl. Rev. 3d Ser. Vol. VI. pp. 1—28.



little represented at present in our great council, yet its Prelates sit there most constitutionally, and any allusion to their being tolerated, or to their inferiority, is an insult, not only to themselves, as the highest order of this third estate, but to all the orders of the estate—to every citizen, as he is the citizen of a nation not entirely atheistical. It is a most specious form of national infidelity to confine the deliberations of the Prelates to what any one may be pleased to designate “a religious subject,” or “the interests of the Church.” The Prelates ought certainly to be *cæteris paribus*, our best theologians, but they are not necessarily so, and every *such* subject belongs to councils and synods of the clergy. But they sit in the House of Lords as Barons—as ennobled by their endowed offices in education—as dignitaries of the Ancestral Church—as the constitutional representatives of the third estate. That they are Bishops of Christ’s Catholic and Apostolical Church is one condition of their thus representing the Ancestral Church and Constitutional Estate, because it has pleased God to make this a Christian nation, and to put it into the heart of “Alfred,” (to keep up our figure,) to give up his family to the Baptism of Christ’s Church; as it is one condition of the king’s accession that he be a Christian, and thus the king himself is an endowed Churchman.

\* \* \* \* \*

‘I do consider it a most unconstitutional attack, for a *martial*, or *diplomatic*, or *legal* aristocrat, personally or hereditarily, to address himself to a spiritual aristocrat, as to no real *peer*, but in some degree an inferior. The attack is twofold; and I will not call it savage, for its cowardice protects it from the epithet. As it attacks a prelate of the Ancestral Church, it is unconstitutional and atheistic; as it attacks a bishop of the Church of Christ, it is apostate and infidel. As long as the Constitution lives in the State, and we have an Ancestral Church—be its spiritual tendencies after true education directed by what ministers it may—such attacks should be parried in the spirit of the body politic:—as long as we have the Church of Christ, such attacks should be at once exposed, as directed really against Him. But in either view, a thousand swords would have leaped from the scabbards of the Barons of old and their followers, ere the solemn feelings of the whole community should have been insulted in the persons of their third representative estate. If such chivalry tended to exaggerate unduly the Clergy, and to promote the priesthood of papal anti-christ, yet it may be possible to go to the other extreme, and become the standard-bearer of infidel antichrist in his last struggles.’

pp. 220—224.

To combat such vaporous stuff as this with the weapons of serious argument would be like fighting a windmill. We know nothing of the Writer of these Letters but from his volume, which is certainly a curious specimen of Cambridge divinity and politics—the politics of the cloister, the divinity of the Star-chamber. Mystical, dogmatical, arrogant, intolerant, the work exhibits all the characteristic marks of fanaticism of the most virulent description. It is quite natural that its Author should

be opposed to the Bible Society—should complain of the prevailing ‘idolatry of the Bible,’ maintaining that ‘the possession of the Bible is not an essential,’ and urging the old Papistical plea, that ‘for fifteen centuries it was a rare possession’ (p. 274): and that he should have renounced his connexion with the Church Missionary Society, which he had ‘ignorantly joined.’ That such a person should hold in contempt every Protestant Church but his own, is equally natural, and affords a striking proof of the schismatical tendency of all Establishments. Every page of the volume is adapted to fortify the Nonconformist in his dissent; and happy indeed might he esteem his escape from the yoke and fangs of the Church, if the Author were a fair specimen of its priesthood.

But the time is gone by when such stuff as this could impose upon the people of England. The principle upon which the Ecclesiastical Establishment rests, must come into discussion. What then is that principle? Is it prescription? Is it utility? Is it State policy? Is it the divine right of the magistrate? The *identity* of the Church and the State has been, we have seen, destroyed. The Toleration Act subverted the ecclesiastical polity of Hooker and the Church of Elizabeth. The connexion then became an Alliance. That Alliance was weakened, not to say annulled, by the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts. Were these liberal measures righteous and wise, or were they not? If they were, why blame the Dissenter who simply asks, that the remains of exploded intolerance may be blotted out from the statute book, and that the State may take the whole nation, and the religion of the nation, under its equal protection, instead of bestowing its pernicious favouritism upon a mere section of the National Church, the episcopal denomination, to the prejudice of the nonconformist communities? If those measures were impolitic, irreligious, atheistic, ‘we must travel back, *if we can*, from our present position, which is called a *perfect* toleration, to an *imperfect* toleration; and as quickly as may be, we must make our escape from an imperfect toleration to an exclusive Establishment, such as it was in the worst days of the worst Stuarts—or of the Tudors.

The alliance between the Church and the State is a *political alliance*, and *nothing more*. It is this which Dissenters wish to see dissolved, as being injurious to both parties, and, in its very nature, as Mr. Binney\* contends, ‘anti-Christian;’—con-

---

\* Our friend Mr. Binney, by a somewhat startling ellipsis, speaks of the ‘absolute dissolution of Church and State’ as a *desideratum*. Every candid reader will perceive his meaning. We wish, he adds, ‘the Establishment, as such, terminated; the episcopal community to become an episcopal denomination on a perfect (civil) equality with every other.’



trary to the genius of Christianity, and hostile to its free propagation. The *religious* alliance between the Church of Christ and the State, every pious Dissenter, in common with every pious Episcopalian, must wish to see drawn yet closer and closer. But that is an alliance which an Establishment was never yet found adapted to promote. Are Dissenters then to be regarded as inimical to the interests of religion, to be branded with opprobrious epithets, to be accused of making common cause with infidels, because they desire the emancipation of the Established Church from its present debasing vassalage? It is not *they* who have raised the cry of Church Reform, but they have a right to express their opinion that all reform will be delusive and inefficient, which does not separate the Church from State patronage and State support, and destroy its pernicious monopoly.

Dissenters have not merely a right to express their opinion, but they are laid under a sort of necessity to do so, by the calumnies of their enemies. They owe it to their cause and to their country, to make their principles clearly understood. It has been continually alleged, that they are ambitious of supplanting the Episcopal Church in the favour of the State; that they hope to participate in the spoils of the Establishment,—to rise on its downfall. They are thus called upon, in justice to themselves, to avow their objections to any State provision, and the grounds of it. If then, they should be thought to boast somewhat too loudly, in certain quarters, of the Voluntary Principle, let this be their excuse; that they thereby voluntarily exclude themselves from any beneficial participation in the national property. The opposite effect of the two systems is thus forcibly contrasted in the Letter to Lord Brougham.

‘ The principle of endowment makes a place for the man; the voluntary principle makes a man for the place. The one is a premium to indolence; the other is the reward of service. The one is indiscriminate, and falls alike on the evil and the good; the other is a nice discernor of character, and apportions remuneration to worth. The one is deceptive, and leads you to conclude on religion where it does not exist; the other shows you things as they are with unerring certainty. The one is deadly, it not only has no life, its tendency is to destroy life where it is; while the other is vivacious, where it is, there is life, to that life it imparts additional vigour; it has an expansive power, which prepares it for emergency, and teaches it to gather confidence from difficulty, and life from exertion. This is true with remarkable uniformity. Endowment withers every thing it touches. Endow a Royal Academy, my Lord, and Genius disappears; and commonplace men are drawn together, who wash each other’s hands and repeat each other’s praises, while the world leaves them to their monopoly and their insignificance. Endow a hospital, and charity seeks some other sphere where she may offer voluntary service and spontaneous sympathy; while her place is filled by perfunctory persons who



crave the place, not to pity the miserable, but to live in comfort. Endow a church, and religion declines and withers and dies; and formality, worldliness, and ultimately infidelity, take its place; except as this may be prevented by the action of different and extrinsic causes.

Again, as to the actual efficiency of the two rival systems, the following facts must be allowed to make out a tolerably strong *case* for the Dissenter.

‘ If by the voluntary principle being not so efficacious as the principle of endowment, it be meant, that it will not so readily provide some 12, 20, or 30,000*l.* per annum, for the bishop or archbishop; that it will not provide for some 4000 clergy without cure of souls; that it will not supply some 300,000*l.* for sinecure allowances, then undoubtedly it is not so efficacious; but if it is meant that it will not so well provide the means of instruction and worship to the people, then we wonder at the boldness which can commit any man to the declaration. The facts, my Lord, are all on one side. In London and its adjacent boroughs we have 459 places of worship; of these, though London is the strong-hold of churches, 265 are dissenting and only 194 are established places. Dissent has spread over the country about 8000 chapels, besides school-houses and preaching-rooms; it has provided for the respectable education and sustenance of a ministry, commensurate with this demand; while it has done this, it has been made to contribute its portion towards the support of an endowed Church; and yet it has, as if refreshed by its exertion, greatly surpassed that Church in its contributions of service and money to those great efforts of christian benevolence which are not of a sectarian but of a general character.

‘ But it is urged, that the voluntary principle will not work uniformly; that though it should provide for the large towns, it could not carry the means of religion into our small villages and agricultural districts. There is something plausible in this argument, and it rests on many conscientious minds as a real difficulty. A simple question or two is sufficient, however, to rectify the judgment. If, by preference any parts of our country were selected as poor and thinly populated, they would be Cornwall and Wales. Who has carried religion over these unpromising districts,—the endowed or the dissenting teacher? One more question: There are in England and Wales 3000 stations at which the curates who serve them have less than 100*l.* a year: these are certainly the smallest and poorest in the country;—could the voluntary principle do less for them? is it not certain, if they deserved to hold their stations at all, that it would do much more for them?

‘ Then it is said, that whatever is allowed in favour of the voluntary principle, it is not sufficiently steady and permanent to be relied on. If by its want of permanence is meant, that it will not continue its support, irrespective of the state, of religion, and of the services and merits of its ministers, then I claim this as a peculiar excellence. It is a faithful indicator, of the presence and power of religion; it fails where it is not, and shows the true state of the place; and it lives and

flourishes where it is, and in its turn contributes eminently to its expansion and permanence. To do more than this ; to supply the outward form and body of religion, except as true religion is near to sustain and animate it, is to do too much ; it is to deceive the eye with the appearances of life, when there is no life ; and it is to propagate death age after age. The small portion of the dissenting church which is endowed, is rather like a sepulchre than a sanctuary. Germany has an endowed church, where religion is on the surface, but where neology is beneath. France has an endowed church, where religion is professed, but where infidelity is real ; and every where it is found to present the most formidable obstacle to the spread of vital religion.

‘ After all, the principle has not had fair trial in our land. It has been more fully and extensively tried in America ; and although attempts have been made to depreciate the state of religion in that land, I am prepared to say advisedly, *that it is better supplied with the means of religion than any other land under heaven.* One of its small and new towns, for instance, as an ordinary sample, contains 6,000 persons ; it has five churches ; and half the population attends them. New York has 200,000 inhabitants ; it has 101 churches ; this will give, at an average attendance of 500 each, a fourth of the population as church-going ; and that of London by the same estimate would give only one-seventh. It has 15,000 churches raised amongst a population of 12,000,000 ; and the average attendance cannot be taken at less than one in four, while that of Great Britain cannot be taken higher than one in five. And what is remarkable is, that it has achieved this with a population doubling itself in fourteen years ; and instead of appealing to the principle of State endowment, as in an emergency, it has announced it as inefficient where it did exist. Thus we have a land, under the greatest disadvantage, without any endowment for the purposes of religious worship, provided with more churches, with a more efficient ministry, and with a better average reward for ministration than we have in our own country, where every advantage has been possessed for ages, and where some three millions a-year are given to uphold an Establishment.’ pp. 51—55.

‘ Blinded by the sectarianism of their institutions’, says Mr. Binney, ‘ the advocates of Establishments shrink from communion with the rest of God’s Church.’ This language is severe ; but is it not just ? Can any thing more strikingly evince the moral blindness of bigotry, than the light in which the political churchman views the astonishing development of the principles of spontaneous exertion and voluntary combination, which has covered the land with religious institutions, and saved the population from relapsing into heathen ignorance ? Even the Fellow of St. Peter’s, while contemptuously depreciating the sectarian teachers, admits that ‘ the common people have been constrained to tax themselves towards supplying a substitute for those blessings’ which the State Church denied them : all they know of that Church in many places is, ‘ that they are the objects of *her legalized neglect.*’ It has been calculated, that *two-fifths* of the

public provision for the religious instruction of the nation are supplied by the voluntary contributions of the Dissenters ; while of the evangelical instruction provided, the proportion furnished by the institutions of Dissent is still more considerable. Attribute this vast amount of religious zeal—still coming far short of the wants of society—to what principle or motive you will, it is a phenomenon that might arrest the attention of the philosophic statesman, a spectacle to warm the heart of every Christian patriot. Seeing that many Churchmen “glory after the flesh”, let it for once be allowed to the Dissenter to glory also. At a recent meeting held in Edinburgh to celebrate the centenary of the Secession Church, a respectful and affectionate reference was made to the evangelical Dissenters of England, in an eloquent speech by A. C. Dick, Esq., Advocate, from which we cannot resist the temptation to make an extract exactly to our present point ; and with this we close for the present.

‘ There are some, who, if you ask them what it is that is wonderful in the religious condition of that great country, will tell you of its ecclesiastical establishment, the elaborate and intricate constitution of its Church, its close intermixture with every institution of the State, of its government by mere half-priests and half-barons, at once bishops and civil legislators, of its luxurious retreats which it offers to the studious, its rich rewards for the learned, and its high bribes to the ambitious. There is, indeed, something in the spectacle which it presents that is interesting, agreeable, and august ; but, after all, if you cast your eyes over Europe, you will see everywhere something of the same kind, with this difference only in favour of the ecclesiastical establishment of England, that its creed, its form of words is more sound, and it surpasses all others in riches and splendour. But, like the rest, it has required for its construction little more than the two instruments of political skill and despotic power ; like them, it is no true index to the moral condition of the country ; but having been created by the force of law, it has been by the same force upheld immovably from age to age ; and as acts of Parliament have made it what it is, it now needs little more than an act of Parliament to level it with the dust. Than this huge religious machinery, even when it covers the whole face of the country, and is bedecked with whatever is costly and ornamental, I think you will agree with me, in holding that the smallest Dissenting congregation is a far more interesting sight. For in it you see a body of men drawn together by the natural influence of Christianity, animated with the noble desire of regenerating and elevating their moral nature, and for that purpose placing themselves voluntarily under the laws of Christ, and observing, in their primitive simplicity, the institutions of his appointment. Here you see the unequivocal presence and working of moral power. There is here nothing merely legal, no political device, no work of art, nothing that gives a show of life over spiritual death. Here is something which statesmen had no hand in producing, and which they have as little power to destroy. Sir, it is for her Dissenting establishments chiefly that Eng-



land may truly boast a moral pre-eminence over the rest of Europe. Let us reflect that religious feeling has given birth, in that country, to no less than eight thousand congregations, of which about six thousand are evangelical, embracing more than one-third of her entire population; a body which, having its apex within or above the middle classes, widens as it descends, till among the lower it takes in, almost without exception, every man whose religious profession will stand a scrutiny—let us reflect on this, and we shall own that we have here a spectacle of no usual grandeur. There are, I believe, some men who pretend to condemn Dissenters as a narrow-minded and bigoted people, as morose and over-scrupulous, because, forsooth, they will not go with them to worship in the temples of the State, nor bow down before the image which Nebuchadnezzar hath set up. Little do they know the motives or the aims of the men whom they presume to stigmatize, otherwise they would form a far different estimate of their character. Sir, the fair realm of England does, indeed, present many scenes which may well make the breast of its Monarch swell with emotion; a broad and fertile country, occupied by an enterprising, free, and generous people, who astonish the world by miracles of art, and are carrying civilized life to its highest pitch of perfection. But from the throne on which he sits, he will discover nothing, truly, half so sublime as five millions of his subjects disowning his, and all human authority in the service of Heaven, and demanding liberty to bear unaided, yet unoppressed, the burden of Christianity. It is in this body of men that we must look for the true conservatives of England. We should certainly expect that they would be cherished by the State of which they are the most valuable subjects. Contemplating their history and their character; recollecting their attachment to order and good government; how they have been the systematic friends of liberty at home, and have at last succeeded in carrying it to our black brethren in the colonies; how they have forwarded the education and sustained the morality of the country; how they have provided a home and shelter for religion, when frozen out of her splendid abodes; and, not content with having the blessing among themselves, have spread it widely abroad; how, in fine, they have vindicated the theology, and adorned the literature of England; we are tempted to ask what rewards have they received from a grateful country—to what honours have they been exalted by the rulers whom they have blessed? Never should we expect that their virtues should have brought upon them disgrace and punishment instead of honour. Yet, true it is, that their first appearance upon the stage in England, was a signal for tyranny and bigotry to let loose a storm of persecution; and that every step of their subsequent progress has been, as it were, up hill, in the face of a tempest of obloquy, contempt, and hatred; and while they were fettered and kept back by restrictive and degrading laws. Even yet, in the light of the nineteenth century, and after the triumph of Reform, they exist, in England, an injured and humiliated caste, and, as religious men, are subjected to some intolerable indignities. I do not speak of the insult of a toleration under which they are still living, neither do I refer to the exclusion of their youth, by sacrilegious tests, from the National Universities, the richest and most famous in the

world ; nor yet to their being taxed for the support of a church, out of which corruptions and errors have driven conscientious men ;—grievances these sufficiently enormous and sufficiently irritating. There are others, however, which are even more vexatious, which do not affect merely the general mass, but which single out and sting, so to speak, each individual among them ; grievances of which, we Scotsmen, who are happily free from the least vestige of them, can scarcely hear without a thrill of indignation. In England, no sooner is the child of a Dissenter born into the world, than the laws mark him out—innocent and unoffending as he is—as one upon whom to inflict an act of gross injustice. His name will not be placed upon the parochial registers, so as to preserve legal evidence of his descent, unless he be first baptized ; but this, although a condition of a civil privilege, which the State has no right to impose, and although it disqualifies a large body of Christians, is not all. The baptism, which will alone procure registration, must be administered by a clergyman of the Established Church. The minister of the parent may not do it, because he is a mere teaching layman in pretended holy orders. His own father, or his own brother, may not perform it, if they are Dissenters, otherwise the child will be deprived of this plain right of citizenship. When, from childhood, he grows up to manhood, and is about to form the holy union of marriage, his religious feelings are again outraged by the tyranny of the laws. At this crisis of a Dissenter's life, he cannot have the presence—he dare not content himself with the blessing of his own Christian minister ; he must have recourse to the legalized priesthood ; he must observe the contemptible forms, and express the childish sentiments of a Liturgy which he repudiates ; otherwise the just and tolerant laws of England will pronounce his wife to be dishonoured, and his children to be illegitimate. But the indignities to which the Dissenters of England are exposed, do not stop here ; another is repeated at the close of their lives, or rather over their lifeless remains. When a Dissenter dies, his relations have, indeed, the liberty of carrying him to their private cemeteries or secret vaults, and there depositing his body in the dust with whatever ceremonies, conducted by whatever minister they please. But if they would lay him in the public churchyard, where it may be that the bones of his family or of his ancestors repose, they cannot have the religious ceremonies, which it is the custom in that country to observe at the place of interment, performed by the minister of their choice. This, it seems, is another monopoly of the favoured sect ; and if a man wishes to pay the last honours to the deceased ; if he wishes to derive to himself some consolation and instruction while standing beside his grave, he can do so only by calling in a man with whom he has no sympathy, and who has no sympathy with him, whom, perhaps, he never saw before, and may never see again, to go over, amidst the tears of the attending friends, the monotonous form which he is paid to rehearse ; and, sometimes, when the deceased, perhaps a child, has not obtained Christian baptism, the bigot, whom the law appoints to officiate, will outrage the feelings of the Dissenting parents by refusing to perform the accustomed ceremony, although he is ready to accord it to the grossest profligate, provided only he has been a Churchman. These we must all acknow-

ledge to be intolerable wrongs. Let us hope that they will be speedily redressed. They are not patiently endured, and in the efforts which are making to put an end to them, all free and generous men are deeply interested. Of their removal, at no distant date, there can be little doubt. The past success of the Dissenters, in ameliorating our persecuting laws, is a pledge and a means of their speedy abrogation. They are a most powerful body—they are nearly free already, and a few strenuous efforts will give them perfect liberty. At present they remind me of the description which Milton gives of the lion in the act of being created, which he represents as rising out of the earth, the head and shoulders and fore part free, and the noble animal pawing to get loose his hinder parts,—

“ Then spring, as broke from bonds,  
And rampant shake his brinded mane.”

Thus it is with the Dissenters of England. Let them but use well the freedom which they have, and they will soon gain all the freedom which they want. And when they succeed, as succeed they must, they, and the whole of England with them, will spring forward, like one who breaks from bonds. There will be nothing terrible in their emancipation. It will be no sectarian triumph—it will not be gained at the expense of justice—it will elevate none unduly, nor depress any one. On the contrary, placing every man upon his just level, making religion free, and the state guiltless of oppression, it will prepare the land for the reception of those blessings which ever follow an observance of the laws of Heaven.\*

Such is THE CASE OF THE DISSENTERS.

---

Art. V.—*Bibliographical Notes on the Book of Jasher.* By Thomas Hartwell Horne, B.D. Prebendary of St. Paul's, &c. pp. 11. London, 1833.

THESE pages are to form part of an Appendix to a new edition of the indefatigable Author's "Introduction to the Critical Study of the Holy Scriptures," now in the press. A small impression of them has been thrown off, with the laudable design of putting the public on their guard against being imposed upon by a reprint of the literary forgery here exposed, which numbers of the clergy have been induced to purchase as an original publication, and a curious, if not authentic work. This Book of Jasher was published by its Author for two shillings and sixpence. The Bristol reprint has been sold at the modest charge of ten shillings, which was subsequently increased to a pound sterling!

The Author of this clumsy forgery was Jacob Ilive, a type-founder and printer, who carried on business in London between

---

\* Patriot Newspaper. Dec. 24, 1833.



the years 1730 and 1763, in which last year he died. In Chalmers's Biographical Dictionary, the following notice is given of him. 'Being not perfectly sound in his mind, he produced some strange works. In 1733, he published an Oration, intended to prove the plurality of worlds, and asserting, that this earth is hell, that the souls of men are apostate angels, and that the fire to punish those confined to this world at the day of judgment will be immaterial . . . . In this strange performance, the Author unveils his deistical principles, and takes no small liberty with the sacred Scriptures, and especially with the character of Moses. Emboldened by this first adventure, he determined to become the public teacher of infidelity. For this purpose, he hired the use of Carpenters' Hall, where, for some time, he delivered his orations, which consisted chiefly of scraps from Tindal, and other similar writers.'

I have published the Book of Jasher in 1751, and notice was taken of it in the Monthly Review for December of that year, exposing its contemptible character and deistical design. 'The whole', says the Reviewer, in conclusion, 'is so full of blunders, inconsistencies, and absurdities, that we think it beneath any further notice.' A few specimens of these are given by Mr. Horne. It may be sufficient to mention, that Alcuin, the supposed Translator, is made to refer to the University of Oxford, which was not founded by King Alfred (the earliest date claimed for it), till 82 years after Alcuin's decease;—and to the paper upon which he wrote, 300 years before the art of making paper was introduced into Europe!! Mr. Horne deserves the thanks of the religious public, for the complete exposure which he has furnished of this shameless forgery, by an almost superfluous exercise of learned pains. He has shewn himself a perfect bibliographical ferret, of whom we caution all literary rats to be aware. Joking apart, we are glad to find that the services he has rendered to the cause of Biblical literature, have at length obtained for him respectable church preferment. He has toiled hard, and well earned what we hope he will long live to enjoy.

---

Art. VI. *A Treatise on Happiness*; consisting of Observations on Health, Property, the Mind and the Passions; with the Virtues and Vices, the Defects and Excellences of Human Life. In two vols. 12mo. London, 1833.

THE reader may judge of the assistance which these volumes are adapted to render him in 'the regulation of human conduct, for the purpose of producing enjoyment,' by the following exquisitely philosophical definition of its general subject.

‘Happiness is that sensation of pleasure or delight by which we are satisfied with ourselves and with all around us. It is a tranquillity; a sweet serenity; an assemblage of enchanting imagery, through which the imagination ranges: it is fairer than the visions of Eastern skies, and more delightful than the perennial glories of a Mahometan paradise. But happiness, pure and unalloyed, is seldom to be found. The sun of enjoyment is frequently clouded; the ocean of life is agitated by storms.

Life without happiness is useless: it is a dreary vacuity of good; an accumulation of evil. We were brought into existence for the purpose of enjoyment.’—pp. 1, 2.

This being the case, all that a man has to do, to fulfil the purpose of his existence, is to take care of his health, attend to the main chance, avoid expensive habits, not be righteous over much, eschew bigotry and fanaticism, get rid of all severe, all uncomfortable opinions, take things easy, and ‘eat, drink, and be merry, for to-morrow we die.’ There is nothing new in the art of happiness, as taught in these volumes. The receipt may be thus given: Of Epicureanism, Stoicism, and Christian Deism, take equal parts: add to these the requisite portion of good-health and good-luck, and—*fiat haustus*. If, however, happiness be, as this writer asserts, no doubt from experience, ‘that sensation of delight by which we are satisfied with ourselves,’ self-complacency would seem to be a very material ingredient. The wise man, indeed tells us, that a ‘good man is satisfied from himself.’ Perhaps this is a mistranslation, and we should read *with* himself. We throw out this merely as a suggestion to the Author; and lest we should run the risk of lessening the sum of *his* happiness by diminishing his satisfaction with himself and those around him, we will say no more about these volumes, than that they are adapted to promote the welfare of the stationer, the printer, and the trunk-maker.

---

Art. VII. *The Amethyst*, for 1834. 12mo. Edinb. Price 8s. in silk.

THE Amethyst maintains its grave, useful, and edifying character; rising among the deciduous Annuals ‘an evergreen’—a Scotch fir amid the light-leaved growth of the shrubbery. And the Editors have endeavoured to impart to this ‘evergreen’, ‘the fragrance of the Rose of Sharon with the lowly graces of the ‘Lily of the Valley.’ A vignette is the only embellishment; the attraction of the work consisting in its ‘sober exhibition of evangelical truth.’ The success which the former volumes have met with, speaks much for the sober-minded taste of the religious readers for whom it is exclusively designed. Among the contributors to this volume, are found, Mr. Montgomery, Bernard Barton, Rev. Dr. Collyer, James Edmeston, J. J. Gurney, Rev.

Henry Grey, Rev. Dr. Belfrage, Rev. Dr. Raffles, Mrs. Opie, Lady Charlotte Erskine, Lucy Barton, Mrs. Mackay, the Editors, &c. &c. These names will speak for themselves and for the volume. Generally speaking, the prose contributions are the best ; but there are some pleasing sonnets and hymns, and Mr. Montgomery has supplied a strain in his loftiest mood, in the stanzas entitled ‘At Home in Heaven.’

## I.

- “ For ever with the Lord ! ”  
 Amen ; so let it be :  
 Life from the dead is in that word ;  
 'Tis immortality.
- ‘ Here in the body pent,  
 Absent from Him I roam,  
 Yet nightly pitch my moving tent  
 A day’s march nearer home.
- ‘ My Father’s house on high !  
 Home of my soul ! how near,  
 At times, to Faith’s foreseeing eye  
 Thy golden gates appear.
- ‘ Ah ! then my spirit faints  
 To reach the land I love,  
 The bright inheritance of saints,  
 Jerusalem above.

## II.

- ‘ Yet clouds will intervene,  
 And all my prospect flies ;  
 Like Noah’s dove, I flit between  
 Rough seas and stormy skies.
- ‘ Anon the clouds dispart ;  
 The winds and waters cease ;  
 And sweetly o’er my gladdened heart  
 Expands the bow of peace.
- ‘ Beneath its glowing arch,  
 Along the hallowed ground,  
 I see cherubic armies march,  
 A camp of fire around.
- ‘ I hear at morn and even,  
 At noon and midnight hour,  
 The choral harmonies of Heaven  
 Earth’s Babel tongues o’erpower.



- ‘ Then, then, I feel that He,  
    (Remembered or forgot,)  
The Lord is never far from me,  
    Though I perceive him not.
- ‘ In darkness or in light,  
    Hidden alike from view,  
I wake and sleep within his sight,  
    Who looks existence through.
- ‘ From the dim hour of birth,  
    Through every changing state  
Of mortal pilgrimage on earth,  
    To its appointed date ;—
- ‘ All that I am, have been,  
    All that I yet may be,  
He sees as he hath ever seen,  
    And shall for ever see.
- ‘ How can I meet his eyes?  
    Mine on the cross I cast,  
And own my life a Saviour’s prize,  
    Mercy from first to last.

III.

- ‘ “ For ever with the Lord !”  
    Father, if ’tis thy will,  
The promise of that faithful word,  
    Even here to me fulfil.
- ‘ Be thou at my right hand,  
    Then can I never fail ;  
Uphold thou me, and I shall stand ;  
    Fight, and I must prevail.
- ‘ So, when my latest breath  
    Shall rend this veil in twain,  
By death I shall escape from death,  
    And life eternal gain.
- ‘ Knowing as I am known,  
    How shall I love that word,  
And oft repeat before the throne,  
    “ For ever with the Lord !”
- ‘ There, though the soul enjoy  
    Communion high and sweet,  
While worms this body must destroy,  
    Both shall in glory meet.
- ‘ The trump of final doom,  
    Will speak the selfsame word,  
And Heaven’s voice thunder through the tomb,,  
    “ For ever with the Lord !”

- ‘ The tomb shall echo deep  
That death-awakening sound,  
The saints shall hear it in their sleep,  
And answer from the ground.
- ‘ Then, while they upward fly,  
That resurrection-word  
Shall be their shout of victory ;  
“ For ever with the Lord ! ”
- ‘ That resurrection-word,  
That shout of victory,  
Once more,—“ For ever with the Lord ! ”  
Amen ; so let it be.’

### ART. VIII.—LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

The Curate of Marsden, or Pastoral Conversations between a Minister and his Parishioners, by E. and M. Attersall, Authors of “ Thomas Martin ”, “ The Contrast ”, &c., will very shortly appear.

Preparing for immediate publication, in two handsome volumes 8vo, A luminous Commentary on the Old and New Testament, with Practical Reflections, by the Rev. Joseph Sutcliffe, A.M.

In a few days will be published, The Art of being Happy, from the French of Droz, in a Series of Letters from a Father to his Children : with Observations and Comments, by Timothy Flint, Esq., Author of “ The History and Geography of the Mississippi Valley,” &c. &c.

The Rev. S. R. Allom is preparing for the press, a Memoir of Richard Hatch, late Student of the Baptist College, Bristol, interspersed with Select Remains.

The Life and Labours of Adam Clarke, LL.D., to which will be added, an Historical Sketch of the Controversy concerning the Sonship of Christ, particularly as connected with the proceedings of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference, is announced for publication during the present month. It is said, that it will be impartial, and that it will contain several letters and parts of letters which have been suppressed.

### ART. IX. WORKS RECENTLY PUBLISHED.

#### BIOGRAPHY.

Memoir of James Brainard Taylor, by Drs. J. H. and W. Rice, of New York. 12mo., 5s. boards.

#### BOTANY.

Maund’s Botanic Garden, Part IX., boards, large 19s. Small 13s. Bordered Edition, for 1833, half Turkey Morocco, 1l. 15s.

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

The Value of Money. By Mrs. Barwell. 18mo. 2s. 6d. cloth.

The Teachers’ Offering for 1833. 1s. 6d. half-bound.

#### THEOLOGY.

Melchizedek. By the Author of Baalam. 12mo. 4s.

Sunday Lessons for Little Children, with a Frontispiece. By Mrs. Barwell. 2s. 6d.